2863

MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL DEBATES

EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

8th to 13th, 16th and 22nd to 25th August 1960.

Volume XXXVIII (Nos. 1 to 11)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGES

Monday, 8th August 1960.

Personnel of the Government of Madras i

Principal officers of the Madras Legislative Council ii

List of Members of the Madras Legislative Council with their constituencies .. .. iii–v

I Questions and Answers 1–4

II Announcements—

(1) Panel of Vice-Chairmen 4

(2) Decision of the Business Advisory Committee 5

III Discussion on the Governor's Address 5–48, 59–63

IV Papers laid on the table of the House 48–58

Tuesday, 9th August 1960.

I Questions and Answers 65–71

II Government Motion—Election of one Member to the Madras Land Improvement Board 71–72

III Discussion on the Governor's Address—*cont.* 72–113

IV Papers laid on the table of the House 113

Wednesday, 10th August 1960.

I Questions and Anwers 115–120, 170–171

II Discussion on the Governor's Address—*cont.* 120–168

III Papers laid on the table of the House 169

PAGES

Thursday, 11*th August* 1960.

I Questions and Answers 173–179

II Government Business—Presentation of the First Supplementary Statement of Expenditure for 1960–61 179–180

III Discussion on the Governor's Address 181–215

IV Papers laid on the table of the House 215

Friday, 12*th August* 1960.

I Questions and Answers 217–220

II Government Business—Annual Financial Statement for the year 1960–61 and Supplementary Financial Statement for the year 1959–60 of the Madras State Electricity Board .. 220–253

III Papers laid on the table of the House 253–254

Saturday, 13*th August* 1960.

I Questions and Answers 255–263
303–304

II Supply of copies of amendments to the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Bill, 1959 263

III Government Motion—Motion under rule 23 (1) of the Madras Council Rules 263–264

IV Presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges on the definition of the term 'Precincts of the House' 264
305–306

V Discussion on the State Electricity Board Budget for 1960–61—*cont.* 264–302

VI Papers laid on the table of the House 302

Tuesday, 16*th August* 1960.

I Questions and Answers 307–313

II Announcement *re* election of one Member to the Madras Land Improvement Board 313

III Government Business—

The Madras State Housing Board Bill, 1960 313

IV Non-official Business—

A. Bill.

The Madras Teacher Protection Bill, 1960 313

B. Resolutions.

(1) Constitution of Statutory Negotiating Committee .. 314–334

(2) Assignment of lands to Harijans 334–338

Monday, 22*nd August* 1960.

I Expression of sorrow at the demise of Sri K. Natarajan, a Member of the old Legislative Council 339

II Questions and Answers 339–346

PAGES

Monday, 22nd August 1960—cont.

III Announcement *re*—
(1) Message from the Governor 346
(2) Message from the Assembly 346–347
(3) Decision of the Business Advisory Committee 347–348

IV Government Bill—The Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Bill, 1960 (L.A. Bill No. 20 of 1959) 348–421, 385–412

V Papers laid on the table of the House 384

Tuesday, 23rd August 1960.

I Questions and Answers 413–419

II Announcement *re* message from the Assembly 419

III Calling attention to high prices and the persistent upward trend of prices of cotton yarn 419–421

IV Government Motion—
Amendments to rules issued under the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 421–422

V Discussion on the First Supplementary Statement of Expenditure for 1960–61 422–456

VI Papers laid on the table of the House 456

Wednesday, 24th August 1960.

I Questions and Answers 457–462, 505–507

II Announcement *re* association of five Members with the Committee on Public Accounts of the Legislative Assembly .. 462

III Government Motion—Policy of the Madras Government on the official language 463–503

IV Papers laid on the table of the House 503–504

Thursday, 25th August 1960

I Questions and Answers 509–514

II Government Motion *re*—
Association of five Members with the Committee on Public Accounts of the Legislative Assembly 514

III Discussion on the Official Language Policy—*cont.* 515–526

IV Government Bill—The Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Bill, 1960 (L.A. Bill No. 20 of 1959)—*cont.* .. 526–581

V Papers laid on the table of the House 581
Index 589–617

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, the 24th August 1960.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at three of the clock, Mr. Chairman (THE HON. DR. P. V. CHERIAN) in the Chair.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Language Pandits

*55 *Q.*—SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Language Pandits in Secondary Schools under the Chingleput District Board are not paid the Government scales of pay; and

(*b*) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (*a*) & (*b*) The district board was not permitted by the Government to adopt the Government scales for Pandits.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Am I correct in thinking that no such difference will exist from the 1st of June 1960?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Of course, I think so, Sir.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: May I incidentally ask whether the Government have taken note of the difference in amount between the old scales and the new scales to be given effect to from the 1st June 1960 and provided for payment in full to such teachers through the supplementary budget that we passed yesterday?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The Supplementary Demands that were discussed yesterday related only to the Government employees. Final orders with reference to the teachers in aided schools will be issued shortly. In respect of the secondary schools it will be possible for them only next year to get it as grant.

SRI T. P. SRINIVASAVARADAN: Are the Government aware that all teachers except the L.Ts. are given the local body scales and not the Government scales?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Yes, that was so. But that has now become past history after the Pay Commission's recommendations. Now there will be uniform scales of pay, whatever be the category of the schools.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Have arrangements been made to meet the full deficit of the district boards, and will the district boards be enabled to pay the teachers their full salary without arrears from 1st of June 1960?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, the district boards are in the passing phase now. Therefore during this period Government have almost taken the full financial responsibility.

VIDWAN SRI T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN : செங்கற்பட்டு ஜில்லா ஆலோசனைக்குழு இந்தத் தமிழாசிரியர்களுக்கு 85 ரூபாய் சம்பளம் கொடுத்து விடலாம் என்று தீர்மானித்து அதை அனுமதிக்க வேண்டுமென்று அரசாங்கத்துக்கு கடிதம் அனுப்பியது. அந்தக் கடிதம் அரசாங்கத்துக்கு எப்போது கிடைத்தது? அந்தக் கடிதத்திற்கு அரசாங்கம் எந்தத் தேதியில் பதிலளித்தது?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : தேதி பற்றிய விவரம் என்னிடம் இல்லை. அந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை வேண்டாம் என்று அரசாங்கம் நிராகரித்து விட்டது. நிராகரித்ததற்குக் காரணம், பணம் இல்லாமலிருக்கும்போதே சர்க்கார் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம் என்று தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது தான்.

VIDWAN SRI T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN : மற்ற 6, 7 மாவட்டக் கழகங்களில் ரூ. 85 வீதம் சம்பளம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. செங்கற்பட்டு மாவட்டத்தில் மட்டும் அது ஏன் மறுக்கப் பட்டது?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : அதற்குக் காரணம் என்ன வென்றால், செங்கற்பட்டு மாவட்டத்தில் பணம் இல்லை.

Delegation to Ceylon and Far East

* 56 *Q.*—SRI S. K. SAMBANDHAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have any proposal to send a delegation to Ceylon and the Far East; and

(*b*) if so, the purposes for which the delegation is proposed?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : (*a*) & (*b*) The Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society is sending a delegation to Ceylon, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Hongkong, Penang, Saigon, Bangkok and Rangoon, for exploring alternative markets for Bleeding Madras Varieties of handloom cloth. The Government have permitted the Director of Handlooms to serve as an Official Member of the Delegation.

SRI S. K. SAMBANDHAN : Is the society sending the delegation or have the Government any part in sending the delegation other than deputing the Director of Handlooms?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : In fact, the Government are meeting half the cost of the delegation.

SRI S. K. SAMBANDHAN : Are the members of the delegation drawn from the members of the society or are there others going with the delegation?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : It is a very representative body. The President of the Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society is one member of the delegation. Then there is one master weaver on the delegation. There are two exporters and one Government servant.

III. GOVERNMENT MOTION.

POLICY OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT ON THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I move—

'That the policy of the Madras Government on the official language be taken into consideration'.

Sir, the term 'language policy' is a very comprehensive one. It includes in it not only the official language. Official language policy itself is two-fold. One is with reference to the official language in the State sphere and the other is with reference to the official language in the Union sphere. Apart from this, the language policy would include the study of the language in the educational curricula. It would also include the policy in regard to the medium of instruction. As far as this resolution is concerned, it is confined to the official language policy. Even this term is used in a general way without indicating whether it is the official language policy of the State or the official language policy of the Union. We are going to deal with the official language of the Union as such. There has been a good deal of controversy with regard to this in the recent past. We are all happy that now the things have cleared to a certain extent. But it is necessary that not only this House should express its opinion but also the country, as a whole, should be aware of the various problems involved in this. They should understand what the correct direction is in which we should proceed. Sir, as far as the official language of the Union is concerned, it is contained in Part XVII of the Constitution, under the heading 'Official Language'. Sir, hon. Members are aware that the various articles contained in Part XVII were arrived at after a good deal of discussion and controversy, and even after a good deal of heat in the Constituent Assembly. The two propositions which came up for consideration before the Members of the Constituent Assembly were (1) whether Hindi should become immediately the official language of the Union and (2) whether there should be a transition period during which English should continue to be the official language and preparations made at a later date for Hindi to become the official language of the Union. These were the two propositions which were debated. At that time there was no question of having English as the official language for ever without any change whatsoever. After discussing this even in the party meetings, ultimately it was Mr. Gopalaswami Iyengar who put forward the solution, which is contained in Part XVII of the Constitution, for the acceptance of the Constituent Assembly. When it was discussed in a preliminary way in the Congress party meeting, it was put to vote, and ultimately this solution was accepted by a majority of one. I am mentioning this because this is referred to sometimes out of context, as if the proposition which was considered at that time was Hindi or English, and that Hindi won the field by a majority of one vote. It is not so. Hindi becoming the official language immediately after the coming into force of the Constitution, was defeated by one vote. What was accepted by the majority of one vote was that there should be a transitional provision, as embodied in Part XVII of the Constitution. Therefore, if the majority of one vote has gone the other way, it would have meant the acceptance of the Hindi language immediately becoming the official language of the Union. That was the position at that time. This was the position in the Congress party of the Constituent Assembly. When it went before the Constituent Assembly, because of the decision already reached by the Congress party, and also because

the members not belonging to the Congress party also considered the various aspects and agreed that the formula put forward was acceptable as a whole, it was accepted with only one member dissenting, and that too not on the principles of the formula but on the question of the adoption of the numerals, because that member thought that international numerals should not be used but only Hindi numerals should be used. He took it as a matter of conscience, and then he voted against this proposition. We need not go into that now. Perhaps we can ignore it altogether. Therefore, Sir, Part XVII with reference to the official language was formulated not in a light-hearted manner but only after a good deal of discussion and after taking into account the various aspects of the language
3-20 p.m. problem. You will find that Article 343 begins with these words—'The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagiri script'. This is how the chapter begins. But it was considered at that time necessary that various safeguards should be provided not only for the benefit of the non-Hindi-speaking people but also for the benefit of the country as a whole, because Hindi was not fully developed for the purpose of being used as official language, and the adoption of Hindi at that stage as the language of the Union would have been a disaster. I have also no doubt about that. Therefore, it was necessary to provide for the transition period. That was one aspect of it. Apart from that, taking India as a whole, it is not as if all people knew Hindi. It was only about 40 to 43 per cent.

SRI T. P. SRINIVASAVARADAN : Thirty-three per cent.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Yes, it was not a majority and I am particular about that.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : It is only spoken Hindi.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not say 'Hindi', but some form of Hindi was spoken. There is what is called Bihari Hindi; there is Rajasthan Hindi; there is also Madrasi Hindi. Therefore, about one-third of the people spoke some form of Hindi. But this question had been decided by the Father of the Nation himself during the freedom struggle. He had given an indication as to what should be the language of the country for all-India purposes. Therefore, I am laying stress on this that even at that time it was recognized that persons who were not accustomed to that language were also aware of the problem. So, taking into consideration that Hindi had not developed to such an extent as to become the official language and that it would create problems for the non-Hindi people, safeguards were made in Part XVII. If we go through the various articles under this part, we will find that the various problems arising from this issue were considered and provision made to solve them. Therefore, when the Language Commission appointed in pursuance of the provisions contained in this part began considering this question, the Government of Madras has to consider the whole question and give a lead to the Commission by submitting a memorandum. I am sure most of the hon. Members here are aware of the steps which the Government of Madras took. We called a conference of all party leaders and then prepared a memorandum on the basis of the unanimous decisions arrived at at the conference on major points. In that conference, one point was considered more than once, and that is whether, in considering the problem, we should seek a constitutional

amendment or we should try to work out whatever safeguards that were necessary under the provisions of the existing Constitution itself. To change the Constitution is not a simple matter. Special procedures are laid down and a certain number of votes are absolutely necessary for the purpose of passing any constitutional amendment. We considered, therefore, whether it would be advantageous to place before the country a proposition that Part XVII should be amended in a particular way or whether it would be enough to work out the safeguards contained in the Constitution itself properly. This was one matter which was considered again and again and ultimately we came to the conclusion—and it was incorporated in the memorandum that we submitted—that it would be possible for us to have the safeguards worked out under the constitutional provisions themselves. In fact, this question came up again before the party leaders because the Language Commission when it submitted its report ignored most of the major recommendations made in our memorandum. It is not necessary now for me to go into the various aspects of that issue on which the Commission differed from us. We once again considered whether a constitutional amendment should be sought for the benefit of the non-Hindi regions and again we came to the conclusion that it was possible to work out the safeguards under the provisions of the Constitution, if only the Parliamentary Committee that was to be appointed later on to examine the Language Commission's recommendations, and the President, who had to pass an order on these, would take note of the recommendations we had made to the Commission. Therefore, we reaffirmed the other point that the constitutional provisions should be so applied as would operate as real safeguards. The second memorandum was prepared and submitted to the Parliamentary Committee only on this basis. Fortunately for us, the Parliamentary Committee took note of the various points which we made in the second memorandum and almost accepted all our recommendations. That is why it was possible for the Members coming from the South who included Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar and other distinguished persons to accept almost all—why almost all ?—the recommendations in their entirety. Therefore, so far as the Parliamentary Committee's report was concerned, all Members from the South accepted it in its entirety. They did not give any dissenting minutes. Of course, there was a dissenting minute, not by all Hindi Members, but you will pardon me, Sir, if I say that . . . (An hon. Member: Fanatics.) fanatics, if that is parliamentary . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is very parliamentary.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Hindi enthusiasts.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Yes, enthusiasts. Let us not say 'fanatics' and let the Press also strike it out. I will call them Hindi enthusiasts who submitted dissenting minutes. Then the report came up before the President and he had to pass an order in pursuance of the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee. Hon. Members are aware that his order should be as indicated in Article 344. It indicates for what purpose the Commission is appointed and clauses (*a*) to (*e*) further indicate on what basis the order must be issued by the President. When the matter came up

before the Parliament, a further step was taken in that the Prime Minister came forward to make a policy statement with regard to
3-30 p.m. the Union language. That is the statement, dated September 4, 1959, made by the Prime Minister on the floor of the Lok Sabha. As a matter of fact this statement of the Prime Minister went a step further than the Parliamentary Committee's Report, and therefore people heaved a sigh of relief that after all it was possible for us to find a solution to this vexed problem of language at the Union level. Then after the discussion in the Lok Sabha, the President passed the order. Unfortunately that order created some suspicions and doubts, and therefore some difficulties, even though if we scrutinise the order carefully to find out whether anything has been stated in that order which was inconsistent with the language policy laid down by the Prime Minister in his speech, or there was anything inconsistent with the recommendations made by the Parliamentary Committee, it is not possible to find any inconsistency whatever because that order was specifically limited to matters referred to in Article 344 and not to other things. But unfortunately it is only in the preamble a reference was made to the Prime Minister's policy speech, and in the order itself there was no mention about the Prime Minister's speech or about the future of the English language after the year 1965. But, Sir, according to me, I respectfully submit that the question 'What would be the position of English after 1965' is not strictly relevant with reference to Article 344 and the order that has got to be passed under the provisions of that Article. The preamble, however, contains a reference to the Prime Minister's policy speech.

After that there have been some editorials in some of the papers in the various parts of the country criticising the President's order. But ultimately everybody was satisfied that we will have to wait and see what further steps would be taken for the purpose of not only implementing the President's order as such but with reference to the policy statement made by the Prime Minister, because after all to work out the accepted formula, certain legislative measures have to be taken. But in the meantime a critical situation was created by the D.M.K. Party in the Madras State. They took the occasion of the visit of the President to this State to stage a demonstration. It was rather an unfortunate decision, because, strictly speaking, the President is the Constitutional Head of the Union. Any order which is passed by him, even though it is passed in his name—perhaps it is even signed by him—and issued in his name, is an order passed by the Government. Unfortunately people made a distinction between the Prime Minister's policy statement and the official order of the President. They made a distinction that the official order issued by the President as such was inconsistent with the policy statement of the Prime Minister. They said that the President, as an individual holding the office of President, had gone out of the way to torpedo and sabotage the Prime Minister's policy statement—the speech he made in the Lok Sabha. Constitutionally it was an impossible position to take. But still, whatever might be the background of it, when such a situation was created, particularly when demonstrations were to be organized against the President, it had to be taken note of even though some thought that it might have been ignored. But my own view was—whether it was a hundred persons taking part in the demonstration or a thousand or ten thousand participating in it—the number did not matter at all. If there had been a demonstration

24th August 1960] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

against the President, it would have been a slur on the people of the Madras State. I have no doubt about it, and in the international and internal field our name would have been in the mud. Fortunately that decision was withdrawn and we should congratulate the D.M.K. party on withdrawing their earlier decision. Whatever might be the reason for this, I am not concerned with it. But certainly they deserve our congratulations because sometimes it is rather difficult to go back upon even a wrong decision. Sometimes it might be easy to go back on a right decision. It is difficult to go back on a wrong decision and in spite of difficulties they did go back, and that is why my congratulations are due to them. We are also happy about it.

Sir, it is at that time various other statements had been made. We never had a black flag demonstration against the King even though his heir-apparent might have had one. But he was not the Head of the State. The Congress never had black flag demonstrations against the Head of a State, the King Emperor or the Queen. If you go into history you will know that. But as far as the demonstrations against the Prime Minister and any Minister whatsoever is concerned, it is a different matter altogether. They are political figures and anybody is entitled to demonstrate and bring to their notice grievances.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sometimes the Ministers like it.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not know. I wish the hon. Member has experience of it. Then perhaps he may be able to say whether he likes that or not. It all depends on individuals. The hon. Member Sri Raza Khan may like it. But that is altogether a different point. But the point for consideration is this. Because this catastrophy had to be averted, further assurances were given by the Prime Minister in a Press Conference and also in reply to a letter received from a D.M.K. Member of the Lok Sabha. The Home Minister at the Centre gave an assurance on the floor of the Lok Sabha. The President also, when he was here and addressed a huge gathering on the Independence Day, referred to this matter.

Now therefore we have reached a particular stage in the language problem when we have to consider what are the other steps to be taken so that the problem might be solved once for all. That is the matter which we have to consider now. It is for that purpose we have again to consider what are the provisions in Part XVII which gives the necessary safeguards for the benefit of the non-Hindi speaking people. Sir, it is all right for persons whose mother tongue is Hindi to be enthusiastic about Hindi becoming the official language, because it is their own mother tongue. They are familiar with the language and even if they did not study in the schools, now it is easy for them to study their mother tongue. Therefore when their own language is being adopted for All-India purposes, certainly they have all the advantages of having their mother-tongue and their own language as the official language. But with reference to persons not conversant with the language, for whom Hindi is not the mother tongue—not only it is not their mother tongue, but completely it is a strange language—a new problem is being created, because they have to study the language anew and then become proficient in that language. Not only have they to become proficient but they have also to compete with

others who have studied Hindi and who have the advantage of having Hindi as their mother-tongue. That is the problem which had to be faced and which had to be solved, and for this we find provisions have been made in Part XVII of the Constitution.

After we submitted the memorandum to the Language Commission, and the Commission had submitted its report together with the recommendations, the whole thing was in the melting pot, because some of the recommendations of the Language Commission were not acceptable not only to the people of the Madras State but also to many of the non-Hindi States. Therefore the Congress Session at Gauhati had to consider this problem. You would pardon me, Sir, if I refer to the part played by me at that time. When the matter came up before the session in the form of a resolution, apart from the plea I put forward for amending it, I also put forward three propositions. If the language problem has got to be settled amicably in a way acceptable to the entire nation including the non-Hindi-speaking people, it should be possible to have the continued use of English even after the year 1965. It is not as if after 1965 for any specific period the English language should be made available. I said that we should have prolonged bilinguism. As a matter of fact at that time the question was put: 'For how long?' This was also reported in the Press then. I said that it should be made available for as long as it was necessary. I went further and said as to who should decide for how long it was necessary. I put forward the specific suggestion that it should be the non-Hindi people who should decide for how long it was necessary, when changes should take place, and when English should be replaced by Hindi. Therefore these three propositions, namely, (1) prolonged bilinguism, (2) for how long it is necessary, and (3) decision as to how long it is necessary, should be made by the non-Hindi speaking people of India. No doubt, at that time, it looked as if I was putting forward something which would not be acceptable particularly to people belonging to the Hindi States. But if we now go through the proceedings of Parliament, and if we go through the Presidential order, we will see that the same words have been used. The very same words have been used in the Prime Ministers declaration of the policy that English would continue to be available as long as it is necessary, and that, for how long it will be necessary will be decided not by the Hindi-speaking people but by the non-Hindi speaking people. If it had been made clear that this was the position, and that there had been no change in spite of the fact that this was not positively mentioned in the regular order of the President, I am sure the confusion and difficulties would not have arisen. But those doubts have been set at rest now. Therefore, we have now reached a point, and everybody has accepted this position. And I think we should fix ourselves to this position. I am glad that Rajaji has welcomed this as the *Magna Carta* for the non-Hindi speaking people, and that we should not in any way by any of our other attempts lose what we have already gained. If we want any further safeguards in addition to this, it should be by having this as the sheet anchor for any further changes. I am not making this point for the purpose of meeting an argument which some people are putting forward that we should seek an abrogation of the Article, and that a new provision should come into existence in the Constitution itself. Once we take the risk of placing before the Lok Sabha a motion for amendment of the Constitution, we do not know what will be the position. After all two-thirds majority

3-40 p.m.

or three-fourths majority is provided for. Even amongst the non-Hindi speaking people, there is no unanimity about this. Taking into consideration all these, it will be seen that it will not be possible to arrive at a real formula. It is not difficult to abrogate Part XVII of the Constitution. But if we do so, there should be some positive and unanimous decision which is acceptable to everybody. That unanimous formula, it is impossible to conceive of at this stage. That is why we ourselves have put forward this formula of prolonged bilinguism and said that this prolonged bilinguism should go on as long as necessary. Having put this forward for how long it should be necessary, will have to be decided by the non-Hindi speaking people. After having accepted these principles, if I may be permitted to say so, it would be rash to throw away all the advantages and put the whole thing again in the melting pot. I am not now considering the position of the people who do not believe in the unity of the country. That is quite a different aspect altogether. To them the question of Hindi does not arise at all. The question of Union language does not arise at all. They have completely a different picture. We do not know who would be taking decisions and what changes would take place at any particular time. I hope those changes would not take place and India would continue to be one. Now what we have to consider is this. We must consider what steps will have to be taken to give a quietus to this vexed problem, which has created so many difficulties among the people. Therefore it is at this stage a further assurance has been given that legislative measures will be taken for the purpose of implementing the Prime Minister's assurance. Unfortunately some people laid great stress on the 4th September speech of the Prime Minister, and said that it was enough for them. I am not concerned with the 4th September speech. It might contain certain ideas. But what we are concerned with is a comprehensive formula, which, as I have said before this House again and again, is contained in the various assurances given by the Prime Minister. Therefore that formula should now be made applicable to the country. Fortunately we have a provision in the Constitution itself whereby this formula could be given effect to by legislation by Parliament. Therefore the next step will be to have Parliamentary legislation for the purpose of implementing this policy. That is how the Government of Madras look at this problem. I hope and trust that this House and the other House also took unanimous decisions with reference to the first memorandum and the second memorandum which we submitted, one to the Language Commission and the other to the Parliament. I hope, Sir, that when we considered this language policy, we took a unanimous decision that we stood by this formula, and that this should be implemented in full without anybody taking advantage of any loophole either in the Constitution or in any law which might be passed. This formula is fully provided for in the law and fully safeguarded in the law that it would not be interfered with without the consent of the non-Hindi speaking people. I do not think, Sir, we should go any farther than this for the purpose of safeguarding our interest. It is unnecessary for me to go into the various other aspects with reference to this, because they have been fully discussed in the press, on the platforms, in the various State Legislatures, and in Parliament also. Therefore, I would submit for the consideration of this House the policy which the Government of Madras have laid down for the purpose of finding a solution to this problem. Let the House give its approval of this policy and indicate the further steps

to be taken for the purpose of implementing this policy. I hope, Sir, even as we gave the lead for solving this problem when the matter was under consideration by the Language Commission, and later on more successfully and effectively when the matter was under consideration by the Parliamentary Committee, and still later on also when it was being considered in the various forums, this House which considers this vexed problem even before the Assembly, would give the lead by taking a unanimous decision with reference to this. I find that Mr. Raza Khan has given notice of two amendments. When they are moved, I shall certainly consider them. Sir, I want to make a few things clear as far as this resolution is concerned. We are considering the Union language policy. I have already given this assurance—I do not know whether I gave it in the other House—that as far as the language policy is concerned, particularly, with reference to the medium of instruction, we will have a full dress debate later on. We may take decisions on that also unanimously so that we may proceed with the implementation of the various policies, with what little equipment we have in English or Tamil. But what we should be more careful about is that our future generation is not placed under a handicap. That should be the thing which we should also have in mind in taking a decision on this matter.

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : I rise on a point of clarification, Sir. What does the Hon. Minister say about the imposition of Hindi on the Central Secretariat staff ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am not here concerned with what is happening in the Central Secretariat. I suppose Parliament is powerful enough, and our Members there are competent enough to safeguard our interests. What is most important is this. We lay down a policy, and if there is anything wrong in the implementation of the policy, I am sure, there are sufficient safeguards against it. I do not think that any authority, however high he may be, will dare interfere with the safeguards which have been provided for in the Constitution, and which are being accepted unanimously. Even at a slight disadvantage to us, we are accepting a particular formula, and if they should tamper with this formula, I have no doubt that they are not the real friends of the country.

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved—

'That the policy of the Madras Government on the official language be taken into consideration.'

Mr. Raza Khan has given notice of two amendments. Is he moving both ?

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Mr. Chairman, in the place of the amendments I have given notice of, I move the following amendments :—

(1) "Add the following at the end :—

3 50 p.m. 'and, on such consideration, this House recommends to the State Government that the Central Government be requested to undertake appropriate legislation in order to implement the Prime Minister's assurances regarding the continued use of the English language for the official purposes of the Indian Union.'"

24th August 1960] [Sri Mohamed Raza Khan]

(2) " Add the followiig at the end:—

' and, on such consideration, this House recommends to the State Government that, as a necessary corollary, freedom be given to educational institutions in the choice of the medium of instruction. ' "

MR. CHAIRMAN : Amendments moved:—

(1) " Add the following at the end:

' and, on such consideration, this House recommends to the State Government that the Central Government be requested to undertake appropriate legislation in order to implement the Prime Minister's assurances regarding the continued use of the English language for the official purposes of the Indian Union. ' "

(2) " Add the following at the end:—

' and, on such consideration, this House recommends to the State Government that, as a necessary corollary, freedom be given to educational institutions in the choice of the medium of instruction.' "

The motion and the amendments are before the House for discussion.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : Mr. Chairman, I consider this debate a very unique debate which has not come a day too soon. We are thankful to the Hon. the Minister for Finance for the history he has given us of the whole sequence of events. History sometimes plays strange tricks. To-day, the history that is given has very little application to the events of to-day or to-morrow. So many things in this State and in other States have happened affecting the consideration of this question of official language. Fresh facts have arisen which must be taken into consideration by everybody interested in the future of the country. It is only on these considerations, the Prime Minister came forward unhesitatingly with that statement which incorporated the formula which the Hon. the Minister for Finance suggested at the Congress session held at Gauhati. We are grateful that the Prime Minister made that statement in Parliament. Reference was made here to the report that was sent by this Government to the Parliamentary Committee and the Language Commission on the ' unanimous ' approval of the leaders of parties here. May I respectfully invite the attention of the Hon. the Minister for Finance to this fact that when we are sitting in committees, we have necessarily sometimes to adjust our differences? In this particular case, it was to strengthen the hands of the State Government that some of us did not proceed as we would have liked to proceed and did not bring in those considerations which, it was positively suggested to us by Government, if I remember aright, might weaken the hands of the Government. We did not press them then. This does not mean that there has been that unanimity that was expected or that unanimity which the Hon. the Minister for Finance said was present then. We had our reservations. But the times were grave and the impact of those who wanted to force this Hindi on the non-Hindi speaking people was so great that many of us felt that it would be perhaps good if at that stage matters were left to be dealt with by the Government themselves. No individual member had any influence; certainly not a member of the Opposition. Therefore it is that we felt that the State Government should be

helped in the first step that they were taking for achieving something which we had in view. It is only in that sense that there was unanimity of opinion. Now the Prime Minister's statement that English will continue for as long as people in the non-Hindi speaking areas want it has entirely changed the position in regard to the language question both at the Centre and in the States. It is one of the historic statements made by the Prime Minister and has naturally been called the *Magna Carta* by no less a person than Rajaji himself for the people in the South. It is really our '*Magna Carta*'. But I am very sorry to say one thing. All this anxiety, stress, agitation and emotion that have been necessitated would not have been there if only the experts in the English language of whom I am not one had been more clear about the statement that was issued on behalf of the Government of India by the President. I am not in a position to reconcile myself, as easily as the Hon. the Minister for Finance has done, that that statement and the Prime Minister's statement are not in any way different.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I did not say that. I said, they were not inconsistent. I am guarded in my language.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : It was not conclusive evidence of the policy laid down by the Prime Minister. But all that is past history and I am glad everybody is feeling happier that this state of affairs has came about. But let me make one thing clear. So far as the question of language is concerned, if it had been looked at from the strict point of view of the use of English, for the official purposes of the Centre, it would have been all right. As far as I understand, official purposes of the Centre simply mean correspondence, reports, statements, Bills, etc. If it is a question that it should be necessarily Hindi that ought to be learnt by the non-Hindi-speaking people, then we must protest. Sir, there is also a move in some Universities that Hindi should be the medium of instruction. There was a suggestion made that the medium of instruction in the Central University of Benares should be Hindi and it raised a storm of protest. As you are well aware, the Central University of Benares is both for the non-Hindi-speaking people and the Hindi-speaking people. Then, they have gone a step further also. We are not yet in 1965 and even now Ministers of the Central Government have started issuing instructions and various forms of directives compelling the departments of the Central Government to see that their staff learn Hindi. When the Railway Department issued such instructions, when the Posts and Telegraphs Department issued such instructions, and many other departments issued similar instructions, there was naturally anxiety on the part of the non-Hindi-speaking people. They felt something was being done which was not consistent with the Constitution. I will give one further instance. It is definitely stated in the Constitution that the form of numerals used in the Government offices shall be the international form of numerals. It is also provided that notwithstanding anything provided elsewhere, after a period of fifteen years after the passing of the Constitution Parliament may by law use the Devanagiri script for numerals. Would it surprise any hon. Member to know that the Devanagiri script is being adopted in certain States even to-day? Not being a constitutional authority, I would like to ask the learned Members of the Bar to say whether it is correct. I ask Mr. Nayagar also whether it is consistent with the

Constitution. (Sri A. Gajapathy Nayagar: Judgment reserved.) I am giving these few facts only to show that the anxiety of the non-Hindi speaking people has been born not out of ignorance but out of the continued steps taken by the Hindi-speaking people in the 'Hindi' States and other places where it is not in force now. 4 p.m. If you will permit me, I will just refer to an incident which occurred when the Central Advisory Board of Education met a couple of years ago. The Hon. the Minister for Education from the Uttar Pradesh—I forget his name. (An Hon. Member: Kamalapathi)—Sri Kamalapathi was participating in the discussion in English. Then it came to his turn to speak on the main motion. Immediately he began to speak in Hindi as that was the official language accepted, and continued doing so in spite of the fact that many members were not able to follow him. Many of us appealed to him that, because it was a very important subject, he should continue to speak in English, which he was doing for over two hours. But he refused to speak in English in spite of the appeal made by the Chairman Sri Shrimali. After he finished his speech, another Education Minister from another State was called on to speak. He got up and said in Telugu "Mr. Chairman I want to speak in my language, which is also one of the accepted national languages mentioned in the Constitution." And this was a great shock to the Hindi members and the Chairman. Therefore the Chairman had to request him to talk in English. May I say that that Minister for Education was no other than Sri S. B. P. Pattabirama Rao of Andhra Pradesh . I do not know if any other Hon. Minister would have done likewise. It would be thought as a simple or a silly matter. But I do feel that we must not forget these facts which we are constantly reminded of so that in the course of whatever we may have got to say, we must boldly but firmly tell our friends that in spite of all the assurances from the high quarters that Hindi will not be imposed on us, the fact of it is that it is being imposed on us in a hundred and one ways. My hon. Friend Dr. Sreenivasan said that the Central Government Secretariat people from the non-Hindi areas were being forced to learn this language before 1965. Even those who are likely to retire in the near future are asked to learn that.

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Attendance is marked at those classes.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : They are asked to learn Hindi and they are to attend classes for this purpose for three days of the week for 1½ hours in the mornings. These are very good things of course. But you should leave it to voluntary effort. As I have said before, I repeat now that if Government want them to learn Hindi they may give a monetary sort of temptation for the people to learn Hindi. Certainly that was what the foreign Government did when they wanted more languages to be learnt. But the question of Hindi or Indian languages assumes a different import in the present context. Let me quote from the speech of the Hon. the Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha on the 7th August of last year. The Prime Minister observed:

'I believe also two things. As I just said, there must be no imposition. Secondly, for an indefinite period—I do not know how long—I should have, I would have, English as an associate additional language which can be used, not because of facilities and all that, though there is something in that, but because I do not wish the people

of the non-Hindi areas to feel that certain doors of advance are closed to them, because they are forced to correspond—the Government, I mean—in the Hindi language. They can correspond in English. So I would have it as an alternate language as long as people require it and the decision for that, I would leave not to the Hindi-knowing people, but to the non-Hindi-knowing people.'

This has always been the magnanimous view of the Hon. the Prime Minister. And more than once I have said that India owes its present position and its future destiny to the catholicity of temperament, wise guidance and the tender manner in which he is able to understand the feelings of those who may not share his own views on many subjects. Continuing he said:

'We talk about Five-Year Plan, industrialisation, science and technology. Every door of that is closed if you do not have foreign languages. You need not have English.'

Here I must emphasise the expression 'foreign languages' and not Hindi or any Indian languages.

'You need not have English. You can have French, German or Russian, if you like, but obviously it is infinitely simpler for us to deal with a language we know than to shift over to German or Russian or Spanish. It is a tremendous job . . . It is inevitable that in the present stage of our development, with our Five-Year Plan, industrialisation, mechanisation, scientific progress and research, you cannot progress by all the Indian languages put together. I say that definitely to-day and if you want to stick to them only, without foreign languages, you do not go ahead. You may have enough science to teach in high schools; you may even get some books for your elementary university course. All that should be done, but science is not the B.A. or the B.Sc. course. Science to-day goes into the jet age, atomic energy, space travel, automation and all that. It is a new age and this House should forgive me if I say something, not derogatory to the House, but still rather critical; and that is, this House does not represent, in numbers I mean, the scientific outlook.'

Sir, I cannot improve on that quotation. The question of language is not merely one which has to be considered from the view point of sentiment. It has to be considered from the view point of the present age, the Plans that we have and the developmental process that all of us think are so very necessary. And all that the country stands to lose if it does not have the opportunity to train young men and young women in the direction in which they should be trained. If we were living a hundred years before, when fortunately or unfortunately these various factors, that have now come to have their own forceful repercussions on the world were not available, then we could have gone on in the way in which we were doing in the pre-Pindaric age. Sir, in the year of grace 1960 he would be a bold person who will say that human knowledge should be tagged on to the possibility of achieving that knowledge from the medium that is readily available and that it should be placed in the hands of everybody at least on a voluntary basis. If we did that, we shall certainly be bringing the hands of the clock backwards.

Sir, I do plead that there are occasions when we should think of it in an all-India pattern in which we are. We cannot forget that to-day. But unfortunately there are differences between State

and State, between one region and another and between one community and another, so that at present from the Himalayas to the Cape Comorin and from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea one sees more evidence in the speeches of people and news appearing in the Press of cleavage and not of the contact and cohesion that ought to be there. I agree fully with the Hon. the Finance Minister when he said that we must promote the unity of the country. And the most important thing to-day in the face of external aggression, in the face of many other problems with which we have to deal, the one thing that we have to see is the promotion of the unity of India. And I think that unity cannot be promoted if fissiparous tendencies develop everywhere. Unfortunately we are to-day strangers even if we live within a few miles of each other. The one great factor that helped to unite India was the language which was familiar to at least a large proportion of the countrymen who took a leading part in the life of the country. But for that, the unity that is there would not be there. I am not an enthusiast for this or that language. I fully agree that everybody should know the mother-tongue. But when it comes to the mother-tongue being the medium of instruction, I maintain that unless it can be proved that at present it will be a substitute for that form of knowledge that we can get by reading a variety of books, that are written in a variety of magazines, that are being made available in a variety of contexts in the national and international fields, we shall have, as I said, slipped back into an age when we shall not progress at all. It is not a question of what may be called the emotional aspect of it. Emotion has got its own limitations unfortunately. In this world, if everybody were to be guided by emotion, and if I were to express all my emotions, it will be different. But what is to happen to the future is the main point that has to be considered. 4-10 P.M.

Sir, reference has been made to Mahatma Gandhi. Fortunately, the President in his recent speech in the Madras beach referred to Mahatma Gandhi also. Let me quote him here. Speaking of the meeting that took place after Mahatma Gandhi returned from South Africa, the President said (and I quote him here), 'When he came to Champaran in 1917, he was just able to speak a few words in Hindi. But he was above all a practical person. He, therefore, told us that he would not insist on Hindi but would speak to us in English and listen to our English. Much of the work that we did there was conducted through the medium of English. That was because he felt that work was more important at that time and therefore he must take recourse to English.' Sir, when people quote Mahatma Gandhi, I hope this also will be quoted, at least in the preamble if not in the main part of the resolution. The same appeal has been made by the Prime Minister of India forty years later. Are we going to listen to him or are we going to act on this language phobia, which has seized the country from one end to the other?

Let me make another reference. I was very happy for personal reasons that the Speaker of the Lok Sabha referred to the possibility of having simultaneous translations in two languages in the Lok Sabha. Hon. Members may not be aware that as far back as 1952, when I returned from Geneva, after attending an international conference, where simultaneous translations were being adopted, I had the temerity to write to the late Mr. Mavlankar, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly here, and also to

you (or to your predecessor I do not remember now), as Chairman of the Legislative Council, that they should consider the possibility of having simultaneous translations in the House, and I also gave a full estimate of a contract from a Swiss firm for introducing these simultaneous translations with ear-phones, etc., which we were accustomed to in all international assemblies. It was working in Delhi at an UNESCO meeting held in 1956. Sir, I do not want to refer to Mr. Mavlankar. But I got a reply from the then Finance Minister here, Mr. Gopala Reddi, that it might be a costly affair, after I had given him information that this Swiss firm could be contracted through me, if necessary, for Rs. 2,50,000 to be spent on the instruments that were necessary for simultaneous translations. I venture to submit in all humility—not because I have always taken the stand that one of the Himalayan blunders of the party in power was the creation of linguistic States—that if my suggestion had been accepted, there would have been less of the separatist tendencies between one State and another; we would be in a much better position, and certainly not in the position in which we are to-day. Almost ten years later, the present Speaker of the Lok Sabha, I am glad to say, is endeavouring—I hope with success—to instal simultaneous translations in the Lok Sabha. I hope that will be a precedent for our Council. I deliberately say that there can be simultaneous translations in two languages. If anybody wants Hindi, he can have that as third language. I am not objectiong to that. But let us have English and Tamil and simultaneous translations so that each of us will appreciate the other's point of view. I shall not say more about it now. I would like hon. Members to realise that this question of language is not to be treated only on the linguistic basis, but that it should be considered in the general perspective of India and its future, of the need for the unity of the country, and of the need to consolidate all our resources for the common cause, that is, the uplift of the citizen all over. On the other hand, if we do not take note of this, and if we do not feel that everybody should develop —I am not for a moment against developing the mother-tongue by all means—we will find ourselves in difficulties. I believe that it will be necessary and useful, and in fact it is incumbent on this Government not to handicap, as the Hon. Minister said, the children of the future generation that have to come up and generations yet unborn. Let us leave some of these very desirable changes to them. I think the Hon. Minister, speaking yesterday on the supplementary budget, said that he would like to leave some changes for the future Education Minister to implement. Likewise, I say 'Let us leave some of these changes to them.' All that I say is, 'Let us at this stage give a certain amount of flexibility for all these. Let us give the opportunity to those who want to change. Let us also give the freedom to those who want the existing state of affairs to continue.' I say this deliberately, because the present position is that bilinguism will continue as long as it is necessary. None of us can anticipate when it will be over—not in my lifetime and not even in the lifetime of all the Members—here put together. At least till the end of this 20th century, we shall have bilinguism. Let us leave these things to the future generation and the new parties that may come into power. Not that I do not want this party to come into power. Having been accustomed to deal with this party for the last fourteen years, I would rather like to deal with them (laughter) than with a new party with a different ideology. It is from this point of view that I say, 'Let us

leave some things to develop in course of time.' There is no hurry for all these changes. This is my plea and this is the reason why the second amendment has also been moved. Thank you, Sir.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, I am at a slight disadvantage to speak immediately after a very brilliant exposition by Dr. A. L. Mudaliar. But when the Finance Minister was speaking and addressing this House, all of us could feel the importance of the question. I might say that more or less twenty-three years before when this issue confronted the State, Madras gave the lead in the matter. The Government convened a conference of the various party leaders and placed the whole issue before them. That conference discussed the issue at length as to what should be the attitude of the Government of Madras in this respect. Till the Madras Government gave a lead in the matter, most of the Southern States, if not all, did not know what exactly they should do. They did not make up their minds. I need not waste the time of the House by going through all that happened at the conference. After a long discussion, that conference came to the decision that they should represent to the Central Government that this linguistic principle should be accepted. That decision was communicated to the Central Government. There were, of course, other people who doubted whether it was right on the part of the Madras Government to have insisted on the bilingual formula rather than that English alone should be used for official purposes. The Government of Madras felt and felt rightly that if they attempted to impose such a thing, their case would be lost. That was the situation in which, if I remember aright, the States of Kerala, Mysore and Andhra endorsed the Government's proposal. That is not all. There is an agitation in Madras with regard to the question of English versus Hindi. Such an agitation is there in West Bengal also. The Bengalis are very touchy and I am told that they have the same apprehension that Hindi will replace English and that they will be at greater disadvantage. Therefore, Sir, West Bengal also gave complete support to Madras in the stand we took. Reference was made to the acceptance of the bilingual formula by the Central Government. Sir, there are forces which work against it even now. As Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar made it clear in his exposition of the case, the Prime Minister's announcement that English would continue almost indefinitely went a long way in allaying the fears of the people in non-Hindi areas. But in spite of that, there are other forces at work to reverse the position taken by the Prime Minister. Hence the apprehension in the South, particularly in Madras, that the Prime Minister's policy would not be followed *in toto* by his colleagues at the Centre. Sir, reference was also made to the President's directives. Unfortunately, the feeling in the South was that the essence or the substance of the weighty pronouncement of the Prime Minister was not incorporated in the President's order and that the Prime Minister's assurances that English would continue to be the official language as long as Hindi-speaking people wanted it were ignored. 4-20 p.m.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : Non-Hindi-speaking people.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : He says 'Hindi-speaking' because he belongs to that group. (Laughter.)

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Therefore, the question arose as to what should be done. I am in entire agreement with what the Hon. the Finance Minister said at the conference of party leaders in regard

to this issue. He said that safeguards could be worked out either by means of legislation or by amending the Constitution. The latest statement by the Home Minister at the Centre, Mr. Pant, makes it clear that legislation would be brought in to amend Article 343 of the Constitution. There is this apprehension about the President's order that Hindi will be allowed to replace English more and more and that eventually most of the work in the country would be carried on only in Hindi.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It is not in the President's order anyhow.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, it is a parliamentary practice not to bring in the name of the President during discussions. But the hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to the speech of the President while he was in Madras and I am just making a passing reference to his speech.. He said that a feeling was growing and developing in the Centre that they should not try to impose Hindi on others and desired that people in the South should not force English on those in Hindi-speaking areas. The question is not one of forcing English on anybody. The question is that the *status quo* must be maintained. We have been accustomed to the use of English for the last one hundred years and more. If it is to be disturbed, we will be disturbing something which has been settled, as the Leader of the Opposition said. If it is a question of asking the Hindi-speaking people to learn Tamil or Malayalam or Kannada, then it is another issue. But people are accustomed, people of this generation are accustomed to the English language, whatever their personal prejudice, sentiments or feelings may be on the question of language. Now let us see what will happen if Hindi becomes the official language. An order can be passed to that effect but there are practical difficulties. I do not know whether the Finance Minister is aware of what is happening in States, predominantly Hindi-speaking areas, where Hindi has been attempted to be made the official language. In one State, Sir, there was recently a good deal of confusion when the notes written by the subordinates in the office could not be followed by the Secretaries and the Secretaries' remarks not clear to the Ministers. They are now reverting to English. Another difficulty about Hindi is this. I know a little bit of Hindi. There is no common script for Hindi. The Hindi spoken in Uttar Pradesh is different from that spoken in Bihar or in Madhya Pradesh or in Rajasthan. Knowing a little bit of Hindi and Urdu, if you listen to the Prime Minister who speaks only the spoken-Hindi, you can easily follow him. Even people who do not have much command of that language can follow him. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition can very easily follow him. But if you take the Hindi that is being forced on the people as the official language, you will find it highly Sanskritised. People cannot understand it. That is another difficulty.

As far as this House is concerned, it is in complete accord with the policy of the Government and we want to give complete support to them on this question. We do welcome Mr. Pant's statement the other day in Parliament that steps would be taken to introduce legislation for this purpose very early. Any delay will only complicate issues, and I am sure the Government of India at the earliest will bring in legislation whereby people in non-Hindi-speaking areas might be satisfied that English will continue as long as they want it as the

official language. As Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar put it and put it very rightly, we cannot envisage what is going to happen in the future. We speak only for the present generation. As far as the present generation is concerned, we know it wants English to be used to the greatest possible extent.

Sir, this really brings me to the second part of my amendment. As the Hon. the Minister for Finance said, we are at present concerned only with the official language at the Centre. We are not concerned with the language at the State level.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I did not say, 'not concerned'. I said 'We are not considering'.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : It is very good. These two issues should of course not be mixed up lest the importance of the major issue should be lost. But one thing which is agitating my mind is this. Suppose we have the regional language as the medium of instruction and at the same time insist that our boys should compete at the examinations held by the Central Government. What will happen to them ? There are two competitive examinations at the Centre, one in English and the other in Hindi. We are already at a disadvantage since boys writing the examinations in Hindi will score higher marks than our boys, so far as Hindi examinations are concerned. Again in regard to examinations in English, our boys will again be at a disadvantage since they cannot write so well as other boys on account of the medium of instruction being Tamil for them in college. It is not necessary for me to expatiate on this question further. We are all in entire agreement with the Government and we give them the fullest support possible. We do appreciate that this is a matter of vital importance not only to us but to the people of the neighbouring States also, and it is good that the Government did not send any proposition on their own responsibility but consulted the leaders of parties here and also secured the support of the neighbouring States. I am sure, Sir, if my amendments are accepted, the Resolution of the Government will command wide support everywhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. S. Natarajan will speak now. Let him make as short a speech as possible since there is not much time.

4-30 p.m.

* SRI S. NATARAJAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I should first congratulate the Government on the consistent steps they have been taking to press the views of the people of this State on the Government of India to secure a policy of bilinguism as far as the official language of the Central or the Union Government is concerned. In this matter the Government have taken all the political parties and the entire people of the State with them. Their efforts have also secured the approval of the other non-Hindi-speaking States. But, however, a situation has arisen when it becomes necessary to ask for legislative guarantees on the Prime Minister's assurance made in 1959, and perhaps further strengthened by the President when he was here in this State recently. In spite of that fact, before a change-over to Hindi, even if they were thought of in accordance with the Language Commission's recommendations or on a mistaken interpretation of the constitutional provisions in regard to the Union Language, efforts are being made in the different States and in the Central Government administration in a very subtle way to impose Hindi. I think two years ago this State invited the attention of the Central Government

to the fact that ordinary forms issued in the post office like the money order forms and post cards were printed in Hindi; they did not even have the English version. This fact was brought to the notice of the Central Government.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: We do not know where to sign even.

SRI S. NATARAJAN : I remember a statement was then made that Tamil and English editions of the forms had been exhausted and therefore Hindi edition of the forms were supplied to the South, and when the present stock of the forms was used up, new forms would be introduced which would contain both the English and the Tamil version. Yesterday I got a form and all the entries in it were in Hindi. The assurance already given was not acted upon by the postal authorities. In this way in many other fields too, in a very subtle manner, imposition of Hindi is going on with the result people think that in 1965 whether the country is prepared or not, Hindi would become the official language of the Union, and then there would be no question of bilinguism whether the Prime Minister had given an assurance or not. Such imposition would cause considerable hardship to the people of the non-Hindi areas.

However, as a result of the strong views expressed by us, the Prime Minister has made that statement. We only want that that statement should have legislative sanction so that after 1962 when there are going to be fresh elections we may have the assurance that that will be the policy of the future Government also. After the elections in 1962 we may have some other Prime Minister or President. We may have a different Cabinet. In that context we may not know what decision that Government may take in regard to this matter. Therefore it is that we want that this policy statement made by the Prime Minister should be secured to us through legislative guarantees. That is the reason why the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Raza Khan to the Government motion requests the Madras Government to take adequate steps to see that the assurances given are implemented or are at least provided for in the form of legislative enactment. (Interruption.) If it is in the legislative form, it cannot be so easily changed, and even if they want to change it, it would take in long time.

Then, Sir, the Central Advisory Board of Education when they considered the question of the study of the languages in the secondary schools accepted the recommendation of the All-India Council for Secondary Education that at the secondary school stage students will have to learn three languages. The formula given was a very elastic one. They stated that one language should be the regional language, the other should be a foreign language preferably English, and the third should be another Indian language other than the regional language. Now, this formula was accepted by the Central Advisory Board of Education. It was also communicated to all the State Governments. Most of the Southern States have changed the courses of study in their High Schools to provide for the study of three languages and our people have taken to the study of the three languages in the spirit in which it was proposed. Hindi is being studied by nearly 80 per cent of the pupils in the secondary schools. This is so in the other non-Hindi States in the South. (Hear, hear.)

24th August 1960] [Sri S. Natarajan]

But I am sorry to say that in none of the Hindi-speaking areas any attempt has been made to introduce the study of an Indian language other than Hindi. Sir, to-day our students compete for the All-India examinations. When their certificates are evaluated by the examining body the ranking of the students who have studied three languages is lower than that of the students who have studied only Hindi. In this way our students are put to a great handicap. While we have taken to this formula in the spirit in which it was offered, the Hindi-speaking State have not adopted it.

Now, Sir, I must also invite the attention of the House very regretfully to another insidious tendency that is going on. Many of our young people who appear for the competitive examinations for the Central services have to undergo both an oral and a written test. They have to go for an interview. Quite a number of our young men come back with the feeling that because they could not answer a few questions put to them in Hindi they have not been selected even though they have done well in the written test. Still people in high places go on repeating that the non-Hindi people are not put to any handicap or hardship, and that they are treated on equal terms. But insidiously in actual practice this not knowing Hindi sufficiently well proves a great handicap to our people. If you will kindly look into the recruitments made during the last four or five years you will notice that there is a steady reduction in the percentage of people selected from the non-Hindi area. These are the ways in which our people are put to serious handicap. It is therefore necessary that we should secure adequate legislative support for the assurances given for a bilingual condition to exist for as long a time as the non-Hindi speaking people would demand it.

Sir, reference has been made to prolonged bilinguism as the official policy of the Centre. I might say not all people are going to Delhi for service under the Central Government or to the Hindi-speaking areas. Even in our own State we have several Central Government offices which are manned entirely by people from this State. Under the new policy these people would require a thorough knowledge of Hindi and perhaps a thorough knowledge of English also, and as they have got to deal with the public also, they must have good knowledge of the regional language also. Even though the Finance Minister said that the question of medium of instruction and the educational facilities in this State would come up for discussion on a separate day allotted for discussion of the language policy, I feel it is linked with the official language policy of the Central Government. We feel that provision should be made so that our students would secure adequate competence in the use of three languages, Hindi, English and the regional language. Some people think that the provision of the study of a language in the secondary school stage is enough guarantee for gaining sufficient competence in the use of that language. In practice it is not so. In our State English was the medium of instruction in our secondary schools, practically in all our secondary schools till 1930. From that year onwards progressively English as medium of instruction has been given up and the regional language has been introduced as the medium of instruction. From 1947 or 1948 onwards there is no school which adopts English as the medium of instruction except in the case of a few institutions for whom special permission has been given by the Government for the benefit of students belonging to certin categories. Now what is the result of

this? Many of our students who complete the high school stage are not able to write one sentence correctly in English or speak it well. 4-40 p.m. It was my privilege to conduct a special course for teachers who had undergone training for two years to qualify themselves for the position of secondary grade teachers. These people had six to seven years of study in English. Some of them had studied in the Pre-University class and had studied two years in the secondary training schools learning the method of teaching English. When a test was applied to them to know how much of the words and structures they had learnt were functional, and what their fluency in speaking was I found that out of the 2,000 words they were supposed to have mastered, they could hardly recognize 700 words. This is the state of affairs, because in learning a language it is not just the learning of the text. It is the use of the language. It is the opportunity for considerable use of that language that helps them to acquire competence in that language. When it is not the medium of instruction, they do not have that facility. Then can at best learn to write and understand the printed word, but when it comes to a question of expressing their own thoughts either in speech or in writing, they are at a serious disadvantage. That is why, Sir, in our educational institutions, as a corollary to the policy of trilinguism, we must have opportunities for our students to acquire sufficient competence in the use of all the three languages. Therefore, schools should be given freedom to adopt as medium of instruction at different stages of the school course or for different subjects in the school course any or all of these three languages. Perhaps any other national language, which is the language of a certain group, should also be used. There should not be one language medium imposed upon all the people, as these people have to serve in different areas. These people should be given ample opportunities of developing their powers and of serving the nation. Therefore, freedom should be given. It is exactly in that spirit the second amendment, which states that as a corollary to the previous one, facilities for our students to acquire knowledge through different media of instruction should also be provided in our State, has been moved. I do not want to take up more time. I have just outlined these points, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity given to me to speak.

(Vidwan T. Muthukannappan in the Chair.)

* DR. A. CHIDAMBARANATHAN : மதிப்பிற்குரிய தலைவர் அவர்களே, நிதியமைச்சர் அவர்கள் மொழிப் பிரச்னைபற்றி விவாதிக்க ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பம் அளித்தமைக்கு முதலில் நன்றியைத் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். நிதியமைச்சருடைய பேச்சு பெரும்பாலும் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடியதாக இருந்தாலும் நம்முடைய குடியரசுத் தலைவருடைய ஆலோசனைக்கும் முக்கிய அமைச்சர் பண்டித நேரு அவர்களுடைய பேச்சுக்கும் அதிகப் பொருந்தாமைகள் இல்லை, பொருந்தாமைகளே இல்லை என்று அவர் எடுத்துக்காட்ட முன்வந்தது இருக்கிறதே, அந்த இடத்திலே கொஞ்சம் தடங்கல், தயக்கம், ஐயம் ஏற்படுகின்றன. எப்படியென்றால், நம்முடைய பிரதமர் பண்டித நேரு அவர்கள் ஆகஸ்ட் 7-ம் தேதி லோக் சபையிலே பேசியதைப்பற்றிக் கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் குறிப்பிடவில்லை. செப்டம்பர் 4-ம் தேதி பேசியதை மாத்திரம் குறிப்பிட்டார்கள். ஆகஸ்ட் 7-ம் தேதி

24th August 1960] [Dr. A. Chidambaranathan]

நம்முடைய பிரதம அமைச்சர் கூறியிருப்பதை எடுத்துப் பார்த்தால், இந்தி புரியாத மக்கள் எந்தக் காலம் வரையிலும் ஆங்கிலத்தை வைத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கூறுகிறார்களோ, அந்தக் காலம் வரையிலும் அதை அரசாங்க அலுவல் மொழியாக வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று தெளிவாக, அழகாகக் கூறியிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது தெரியவரும். அவ்வாறு அது நம்முடைய குடியரசுத் தலைவர் ஆணையில்தான் இயம்பப்படவில்லை. அதைத் தான் சுட்டிக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். அவர் அதை எடுத்துக் காட்டவில்லை. பிரஸிடெண்ட்டுடைய ஆணையில் இல்லை என்பதை நான் வாசகம் மூலமாக எடுத்துக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். இப் பொழுதுள்ள குடியரசுத் தலைவருடைய ஆணையில் இம்மாதிரி இருக்கிறது. 'No restriction should be imposed for the present on the use of English for any of the purposes of the Union and provision should be made in terms of Clause (3) of Article 343 for the continued use of English even after 1965, . . . etc.' ஆங்கிலம் உபயோகப்படுத்துவதிலே தடை இருக்காது 1965-வரையிலும், ஆனால், தற்காலிகமாக, இப்போழுது, தற்போது என்றுதான், 'For the present', 'For the time being' என்பதற்குப் பொருளாகும். ஆகையால்தான் 1965-க்குப் பிற்பாடு என்ன நிலை உண்டாகும் என்பதைச் சிந்திக்கக் கடமைப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம். இப்பொழுது இந்திய அரசியல் அமைப்புச் சட்டம் 343, உட்பிரிவு 3-இன்படி சில வகைகளுக்குத்தான் 1965-க்குப் பிற்பட்டு ஆங்கிலத்தை ஏதோ ஒரு சலுகை காட்டி வழங்கக்கூடிய நிலைமை இருக்கிறது. 'For such purposes as the Parliament may legislate' என்று இருக்கிறது. 'Nothwithstanding anything in this article Parliament may by law provide for the use after the said period of 15 years of the English language for such purpases as may be specified in the Law' என்று இந்திய அரசியல் சட்டத்தில் உளது. இந்தப் பகுதி கட்டாயமாகப் பார்லிமெண்டில் மாற்றப் படவேண்டும். அப்படி மாற்றப்படவில்லை என்றால், நம்முடைய மாநில மக்கள், வேறு இந்தி பேசப்படாத மாநில மக்கள் போல இடர்ப்படுவார்கள் என்பது உறுதி. அதுதான் இப்பொழுது எதிர்க்கட்சியினர் கொண்டுவர இருக்கின்ற திருத்தத்தின் நோக்கம் என்று எடுத்துக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். 'English should be used for such purposes as may be specified' என்று இருப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக 'For all purposes for which it is at present used' என்று இருக்கவேண்டும் என்பது என்னுடைய கருத்து. இப்பொழுது எந்தெந்த வகைகளுக்கு நாம் ஆங்கிலத்தைப் பயன்படுத்தி வருகிறோமோ அந்தந்த வகைகளுக்குத் தொடர்ந்து 1965-க்கு அப்பாலும், ஆங்கிலம் சட்டபூர்வமாக வழங்கப்படவேண்டும் என்பதுதான் நோக்கம். எதோ சில அதிகாரிகள், நல்ல அதிகாரத்தில் உள்ளவர்கள் கூறுகிறார்கள் சில நேரங்களில், "இந்தியை நாங்கள் உங்களிடம் சுமத்தக்கூடாது என்று சொல்லுவதுபோல் ஆங்கிலத்தை எங்களிடம் சுமத்த வேண்டாம்" என்று. யார் அப்படிச் சுமத்துகிறார்கள்? ஆங்கிலம் நம் தேச மக்களோடு இருக்கிறது. அது சுமத்தப்பட்ட காலம்

[Dr. A. Chidambaranathan] [24th August 1960

வேறு. ஆனால் இப்பொழுது சுமத்தப்படவில்லை என்பது தெளிவு. தென்னிந்திய மொழிகளில் ஒன்றுகிய தமிழைக் கட்டாயமாக வட இந்திய மக்கள் படிக்கவேண்டும் என்று சட்டம் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று நாம் கேட்போமேயானால், தென்னிந்திய மொழியைச் சுமத்தப் பார்க்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லலாம். அப்படி நாம் பேசவில்லை, கேட்கவில்லை. இந்நிலையில் ஆங்கிலத்தை எங்கள் மீது சுமத்துகிறார்கள் என்பது பொருத்தமற்ற செய்தியாகும். இந்தியைக் கட்டாயமாகச் சுமத்தாதீர்கள் என்று சொன்னால், ஆங்கிலத்தைச் சுமத்தாதீர்கள் என்று சொல்லுவது பொருந்தாது, சில நேரங்களில் காந்தி அடிகளின் பெயரைப் பயன் படுத்திக்கொள்ளுகிறோம். இந்தி, இந்திய மக்கள், ஒற்றுமையாக இருப்பதற்குத் தேவை என்று அவர் சொன்னார் என்று சொல்லு கிறபோது, கதர் கட்டாயமாகக் கட்டவேண்டும் என்று கூறினார். அவர் எந்தத் தனி மனிதனும் 500 ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் சம்பளம் வாங்கக் கூடாது என்று சொன்னார். அதை நாம் கேட்கவில்லை, அதன்படி சட்டம் செய்யவில்லை. ஆகையால், காந்தியடிகளை இழுத்து, இந்தி கட்டாயமாக ஒற்றுமை மொழியாக இருக்க வேண்டும் என்று, நமது தேசத் தந்தை சொன்னதைச் செய்யக் கடமைப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லுவது எந்த அளவுக்குப் பொருந்தும் என்று சிந்தித்துப்பார்க்கவேண்டும் என்று வற் புறுத்துகிறேன். ஆனால், இந்தியைக் கட்டாயமாக அல்லாமல் விரும்பிப் படித்து அதன் காரணமாகப் பல துறைகளிலும் வெற்றி பெறவேண்டும் என்பதுதான் நம்முடைய விருப்பம். இந்தமாதிரி நம்முடைய மாநிலச் சூழ்நிலை இருந்து வருகிறது என்பது தெளிவு. கட்டாயப்படுத்தவேண்டாம் என்பதுதான் நாம் கேட்பது. இப்பொழுது சட்டபூர்வமாக இந்த 343 (3), உட் பிரிவைத் திருத்தினால் அன்றி, 1965-க்குப் பிற்பாடு இந்த இந்தி நம்மீது சுமத்தப்பட இருப்பதைத் தடுக்க முடியாது. பாராளு மன்றத்தில் திருத்துவதற்குக் கட்டாயமாகச் சட்டம் கொண்டு வரவேண்டும் என்பதுதான் நாம் கேட்பது. கனம் நிதி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் பாராளுமன்றத்துக்குப் புதிதாகச் சட்டத் திருத்தம் வேண்டும் என்று பிரேரணை கொண்டு போனால், என்ன ஆகுமோ என்று அச்சம் தெரிவித்தார். அவ்வச்சம் எந்த அளவுக்குப் பொருத்தம் என்று ஆராயவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன். ஆங்கில மொழி 1965-க்குப் பிறகும், எல்லாவகை களிலும் இந்திய அலுவல் மொழியாக இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று சட்டம் செய்வதில் இந்தியா தேசத்தின் ஒற்றுமைக்கு இடர்வரக் கூடாது என்று எண்ணும் எல்லாக் கட்சி உறுப்பினர்களும் மிக்க பொறுப்புடையவர் என்றும் அப்பொறுப்பினைப் பாராளு மன்ற உறுப்பினர்கள் ஏற்றுச் செயல் புரிவார்கள் என்று எதிர் பார்க்கிறேன் என்றும் சொல்லி முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன். வணக்கம்.

4-50 p.m.

* SRI V. RAMALINGAM PILLAI: மதிப்பிற்குரிய தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்த மொழிப் பிரச்னை, மிகவும் நிதானமாக ஆராய வேண்டிய விஷயம். இந்த நாட்டின் ஐக்கியத்தைப் பொறுத்தது இந்த விஷயம். கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் மிகவும் நிதான புத்தியோடு அறிக்கை வெளியிட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களை நான் மனமார

வாழ்த்துகிறேன். இந்தப் பிரச்னையிலே தமிழ் மொழி, ஹிந்தி மொழி, ஆங்கில மொழி ஆகிய மூன்று மொழிகள் கலந்திருக்கின்றன. தமிழ் மொழியானது பல்லாயிரம் ஆண்டுகளுக்கு முன்னாலே இலக்கணச் சிறப்பும், இலக்கியச் சிறப்பும் பெற்றது. தமிழ் மொழியானது இந்தியாவிலே உண்டான முதல் மொழி என்று சொல்வாரும் உண்டு, முதல் இரண்டு மொழிகளிலே ஒரு மொழி என்று சொல்வாரும் உண்டு. அது எப்படி இருந்தாலும், தமிழ் மொழி மிகப் புராதனமானது; உலக அறிவாளிகளெல்லாம் மெச்சக்கூடிய திருக்குறள், கம்ப ராமாயணம், சிலப்பதிகாரம் முதலிய இலக்கியங்கள் அமைந்தது.

"யாமறிந்த மொழிகளிலே தமிழ் மொழிபோல்
இனிதாவ தெங்கும் காணோம்" என்றும்,
"யாமறிந்த புலவரிலே கம்பனைப் போல்
வள்ளுவர்போல், இளங்கோவைப்போல்
பூமிதனில் யாங்கணுமே பிறந்ததில்லை"

என்றும் பாரதியார் பாடிய சிறப்புக்கு முற்றிலும் உரித்தானது தமிழ். தமிழ் மொழி இப்பேர்ப்பட்டது. வேறு மொழி வந்தால் தமிழ் மொழி போய்விடுமோ என்று நாம் பயப்பட வேண்டிய அவசியமேயில்லை என்று நம் அரசாங்கம் தீர்மானித்துவிட்டது. எல்லாத் துறைகளிலும் தமிழுக்குச் சிறப்பிடம் அளிக்க நமது மாநில அரசாங்கத்தார் ஏற்பாடு செய்து வருகிறார்கள். எனவே தமிழுக்கு பயமில்லை என்பது நிச்சயமாகிவிட்டது.

இனி ஹிந்தி மொழியைப்பற்றிப் பேசுவோம். ஹிந்தி மொழியானது தமிழ் நாட்டுக்குள் வரக் கூடாது என்றும், டெல்லியின் பிடியிலிருந்து சென்னை மாநிலம் பிரிந்துவிட வேண்டும் என்றும் கோருபவர்கள் உண்டு. அவர்களுடைய தமிழ் அபிமானத்தையும் தமிழ் நாட்டு அபிமானத்தையும் நான் பாராட்டுகிறேன். அதை நான் குறைகூறவில்லை. ஆனால் அவர்கள் கூறுவதைப் பற்றி தீர்க்காலோசனை செய்ய வேண்டும். தமிழ்நாடு டெல்லியிலிருந்து முற்றிலும் பிரிந்துவிட முடியுமா? அப்படி முடியுமானாலும், அது நல்லதா என்று தீர்க்க ஆலோசனை செய்ய வேண்டும்.

"முடிவும் இடையூறும் முற்றியாங்கு எய்தும்
படுபயனும் பார்த்துச் செயல்"

என்று வள்ளுவனார் சொல்லுகிறார். நாம் சொல்லுகிற காரியம் சாத்தியமா, அதைச் செய்தால் நன்மை ஏற்படுமா அல்லது தீமை ஏற்படுமா என்றெல்லாம் பார்த்துச் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று அவர் கூறுகிறார். தமிழ் நாட்டில் ஹிந்தியைப் புகுத்தக் கூடாது என்று சொல்லுபவர்கள் உண்டு. வடநாட்டிலிருந்து தமிழ் நாட்டுக்கோ அல்லது தமிழ் நாட்டிலிருந்து வட நாட்டுக்கோ, தந்தியோ, தபாலோ, ரெயிலோ, வியாபாரச் சாமான்களோ போகாதபடி செய்தால் நாம் இங்கே ஹிந்தியும் வராதபடி செய்ய முடியும். அது வேண்டாம், டெல்லியிலிருந்து நாம் விடுபட்டால் போதும், நாம் ஹிந்தி இங்கே வராதபடி செய்துவிடலாம் என்று சில அன்பர்கள் சொல்கிறார்கள்.

டெல்லியிலிருந்து நாம் விடுபட முடியுமா, அப்படி விடுபட்டால் அது நன்மையா என்று நான் அவர்களையெல்லாம் நிதானமாகக் கேட்கிறேன். இந்த விஷயத்தை, காங்கிரஸானாலும் சரி, மற்றக் கட்சியினர் ஆனாலும் சரி, எக்கட்சியினரும் கட்சி மனப்பான்மை கொண்டு, ஆராயக் கூடாது. டெல்லியிலிருந்து நாம் பிரிய வேண்டுமானால், நாம் இப்போது ஜனநாயக முறையில் எப்படிப் பிரிய முடியும்? தமிழ் நாட்டிலிருந்து டெல்லிக்குப் போயிருக்கும் பார்லிமெண்ட் மெம்பர்கள் எல்லோரும் சேர்ந்து ஒரு தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்தாலும், 'தமிழ்நாட்டைப் பிரித்து விடலாம்' என்று மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தார் ஒத்துக்கொள்வார்களா? மாட்டார்கள். அப்படி ஜனநாயக முறையில் நாம் பிரிய முடியாது என்றால் வேறு எந்த வழி இருக்கிறது? இரண்டு வழிகள் இருக்கின்றன. அவை ஆயுதப் போரும், சாத்வீகப் போரும் ஆகும். தமிழ் நாட்டவர்கள் ஆயுதப் போர் நடத்தி டெல்லியை வென்றுவிடலாம் என்று நினைத்தாலும், அதற்கு ஆயிரக்கணக்கான பேர் ஆதரவு காட்டினாலும், தமிழ்நாட்டவருக்கு எப்படி ஆயுதம் கிடைக்கும்? ஆயுதங்கள் கொடுக்கக் கூடிய நாடுகளாகிய ரஷியா, அமெரிக்கா, பிரான்ஸ், இத்தாலி போன்ற நாடுகள் டெல்லி அரசாங்கத்துடன் நட்புடன் இருக்கும் போது, அதற்கு விரோதமாகச் சண்டை செய்யச் சொல்லி அவர்கள் நமக்கு ஆயுதங்கள் கொடுப்பார்களா? ஆயுதங்கள் கிடைக்கும் என்றே வைத்துக்கொள்வோம். டெல்லி அரசாங்கத்துடன் மற்ற ராஜ்யங்கள் சேர்ந்திருக்கும்போது தமிழர்கள் மட்டும் தனித்தே நின்று டெல்லி அரசாங்கத்தை வென்றுவிட முடியுமா? ஆகவே இந்தப் போர் முறை நடக்காத காரியம். சாத்வீக முறையைக் கையாளலாம் என்றால், சாத்வீக முறையைக் கையாண்ட காந்தியை அறிந்தவர்கள், இந்தியா எப்படி இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று காந்திஜி விரும்பினர் என்பதை அறிந்தவர்கள், இந்த சாத்வீக சத்தியாக்கிரகத்தில் சேர மாட்டார்கள். ஆகவே அந்த வழியிலும் வெற்றி கிடைக்காது. எனவே எப்படிப் பார்த்தாலும், டெல்லியை விட்டுப் பிரியக்கூடிய நிலைமை இல்லை.

டெல்லியை விட்டுப் பிரிந்தோம் என்று வைத்துக்கொள்வோம். பிரிந்து விடுவது நல்லது என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். டெல்லியை விட்டுப் பிரிந்தால் நன்மை அதிகமா, தீமை அதிகமா என்று பார்ப்போம். சில அன்பர்கள் புள்ளிக் கணக்குகள் காட்டி, "தமிழ் நாட்டிலிருந்து ஏராளமான பணம் மத்திய சர்க்காருக்குப் போகிறது. அதிலிருந்து மத்திய சர்க்கார் நமக்குக் கொடுக்கும் பணம் மிகக் கொஞ்சம் தான். நாம் தனியே இருந்தால் நமது பணம் அத்தனையும் நமக்கு உதவுமல்லவா?" என்று கேட்கிறார்கள். அந்தப் புள்ளி விவரங்கள் எல்லாம் சரியாக இருந்தாலும்கூட, நாம் ஒரு விஷயத்தை எண்ணிப் பார்க்க வேண்டும்.

"படை குடி கூழ் அமைச்சு நட்பரண் ஆறும்
உடையான் அரசருள் ஏறு"

என்று வள்ளுவர் சொல்கிறார். வள்ளுவர் சொல்கிறபடி, ஒரு தனி ராஜ்யத்திற்கு படை, கூழ், குடி, அரண், நல்ல அமைச்சு,

நட்பு இவைகளெல்லாம் இருக்க வேண்டும். முதலில் படை இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று அவர் சொல்கிறார். நம்முடைய தமிழ் நாடு தனியே பிரிந்து விட்டால் நமக்குப் படை வேண்டும். நமக்குக் காலாட் படை வேண்டும். நம் ராஜ்யத்தில் கிட்டத்தட்ட 300 மைல் நீளமுள்ள கடற்கரை இருப்பதால் நமக்குக் கடற்படையும் வேண்டும். நம்முடையது என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்வதற்கு, நம்முடையது என்று ஒரு ஆகாயப் படையும் வேண்டும். இந்த மூன்று படைகளையும் அவைகளுக்கு வேண்டிய ஆயுதங்களையும் நாம் சேகரிக்க வேண்டுமானால் எவ்வளவு செலவாகும் என்று நாம் மதிப்பிட்டு அதற்குப் பிறகு நம்மிடமுள்ள பணத்தைப் பார்த்தால், நமக்கு மிஞ்சக்கூடிய பணம் மிகக் கம்மியாகத் தான் இருக்கும். ஆகவே மத்திய சர்க்காரை விட்டுப் பிரிவதைக் காட்டிலும் மத்திய சர்க்காருடன் போராடிக்கொண்டிருக்கலாம்; இன்னும் அதிகமாகப் பணம் கொடுங்கள் என்று அவர்களிடம் கேட்கலாம்; வம்பு செய்யலாம்; அவர்களோடு வழக்கு செய்யலாம். மேலும், மத்தியில் குவிந்து கிடக்கும் அதிகாரங்களைப் பரவலாக ராஜ்யங்களுக்குக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று நாம் கோரலாம். அப்படியெல்லாம் செய்வது நல்லதேயல்லாமல் பிரிந்து போவதில் லாபமில்லை என்று நிச்சயமாகத் தெரிகிறது. நாம் பிரியாவிட்டால் நம் இந்தியா முழுவதும் பாகிஸ்தான் தவிர ஒரு அரசாங்கத்தின் கீழே தான் இருக்க வேண்டும். அப்படியென்றால், மற்றெல்லா மாநிலங்களும் விரும்பும் ஹிந்தி மொழியை நாம் விலக்கிவிடலாமா? அதை நாமும் ஒத்துக்கொள்வதே மனிதத்தனம். எனவே ஹிந்தி வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்வது வெறும் விதண்டாவாதமே தவிர வேறேது?

இனி ஆங்கிலத்தைப்பற்றிப் பேசுவோம். ஆங்கில மொழியானது பரதேச மொழி. அதனால் அதை இந்தியாவை விட்டு அடியோடு ஓட்டாலிட்டால் தவறு என்பது போல் பேச்சு நடந்து வருகிறது. எல்லாத் துறைகளிலும் ஆங்கிலத்தை ஒழித்துவிட வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது. நான் ஆங்கில மோகம் கொண்டிருப்பவன் அல்ல. ஆனால் ஆங்கிலத்தைப்பற்றிச் சொல்லப்படும் அநீதியைமட்டும் எடுத்துக்கூற விரும்புகிறேன். ஆங்கிலம் பரதேச மொழியானால், பதின்மூன்று ஆண்டுகளுக்கு முன் வெள்ளைக்காரர்களை இந்த நாட்டை விட்டு வெளியே அனுப்பியபோது நாம் சுதேச முறையில் என்னியா நம் அரசியலை அமைத்துக்கொண்டோம்? அப்போது நாம் சுகர் நீதியையாவது மனுதர்ம சாஸ்திரத்தையாவது, திருக்குறளையாவது ஆராய முற்பட்டோமா? அவற்றை ஆராய்ந்து சட்டம் இயற்றினோமா? இங்கிலீஷின் பிறப்பிடமாகிய இங்கிலாந்து தேசத்துச் சட்டத்தையும், இங்கிலீஷ் மொழியில் நடந்து வருகிற அமெரிக்கா தேசத்துச் சட்டத்தையும் பார்த்துத்தானே நமது நாட்டின் அரசியல் சட்டத்தை இயற்றினோம். அது போகட்டும். இப்போது இருக்கும் பார்லிமெண்டும், இந்தக் கவுன்சிலும், அஸெம்பிளியும் சுதேசிய முறையை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டவையா? அதுவும்

5-00 p.m.

[Sri V. Ramalingam Pillai] [24th August 1960

போகட்டும். நமது தேர்தல் முறைகள் சுதேசிய முறையை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டவையா? இப்போதுள்ள தேர்தல் முறைப்படி, நாமக்கல்லே எட்டிக் கூடப் பார்க்காமல் இங்கே இருப்பவர், எங்கள் ஊரில் தேர்தலுக்கு நிற்கலாம். அது மட்டு மல்ல. அவர் பல இடங்களில் தேர்தலுக்கு நின்று தேர்தலில் ஜெயித்து, கடைசியில் ஒரு இடத்தில் தம் பதவியை வைத்துக் கொண்டு மற்ற இடங்களில் தம் பதவியை ராஜினமாச் செய்து விடலாம். இதெல்லாம் சுதேசிய முறையை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டவையா? மேலும், நம் நீதிமன்றங்களில் நாம் பிரயோகிக்கும் கிரிமினல் ப்ரொஸீஜர் கோட், சிவில் ப்ரொஸீஜர் கோட் முதலிய சட்டங்களெல்லாம் சுதேசியமா? ஒரு கிராமத்தில் இரண்டு பேர் சண்டை செய்கிறார்கள் என்று வைத்துக் கொள்வோம். ஒருவன் மற்றவனை அடித்துப் படுகாயப்படுத்தி விடுகிறான். அடிபட்டவன் கீழே விழுந்துவிடுகிறான். அதை கிராமக் கணக்குப்பிள்ளை, கிராம முன்சீபு முதலியவர்கள் பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் ஒன்றும் செய்ய முடியவில்லை. இதைப்பற்றி 10, 20 மைல்களுக்கு அப்பாலுள்ள ஸப்-மாஜிஸ்டிரேட்டிடம் சென்று அவரிடம் பிராது கொடுக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

ஆள் அடிபட்டுக்கொண்டு, உதை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு மேஜிஸ்ட்ரேட் கோர்ட்டுக்குப் போகிறதுக்கு முன்னாலே உதைத்தவன் போகிறான். கடைசியிலே பெருத்த சாட்சியம் எல்லாம் எடுத்துச் சொல்லி உதைத்தவனுக்குச் சாதகமாகத் தீர்ப்பு வருகிறது. நம் இங்கிலீஷ் வைத்தியமுறையிலே, நம்முடைய ஆஸ்பத்திரிகளிலே நல்ல அற்புதமான சிகிச்சைகளை எல்லாம் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் கையாளுகிற மருந்துகள் எல்லாம் ஆங்கிலமுறை, இந்த ஆஸ்பத்திரி கட்டி இருக்கிறமுறை, அதை சுத்தமாக வைத்திருக் கிறமுறை, எல்லாம் இங்கிலீஷ்முறை. அதுமட்டுமல்ல. நம் முடைய குடும்பங்களிலே சூட், ஹேட், பூட்ஸ் போடும் முறை சுதேசி முறையா? நான் ஏளனம் செய்யவில்லை. சௌகரியம் உள்ளவர்கள் போட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். அது சுதேசி முறையா என்று கேட்கிறேன். நம்முடைய வாழ்க்கை யிலே எல்லாத் துறையிலும் ஆங்கிலமுறையைப் பின்பற்றிவிட்டு ஆங்கிலம் பரதேச மொழி, அதை அடியோடு ஒழிக்கவேண்டும் என்று பேசுவது நியாயமா, நேர்மையா என்று கேட்கிறேன். அது மட்டும் அல்லாமல் ஆங்கில மொழி பரதேச மொழியானால் இந்தி மொழி சுதேசி மொழியா? சரித்திரம் படித்தவர்கள் சொல்லுங் கள். இந்திய நாட்டை கஜ்னி மகம்மது படையெடுத்தான், பலமுறை படையெடுத்து கொள்ளை அடித்துக்கொண்டு போனான். சோமனாதபுரத்தை அழித்தான். ஏராளமான செல்வத்தைக் கொண்டு போனான். அதைப் பார்த்துப் பின்னாலே படையெடுத்து மகமத் கோரி வந்தான். மகமத் கோரி கொள்ளையடித்துக் கொண்டு ஓடிவிடாமல் இந்தியாவில் தன் ஆட்சியை ஸ்தாபித்தான். அதன் பிறகுதான் நாட்டிலே பரதேச மொழியாகிய இந்துஸ்தானி

வழங்க ஆரம்பித்தது. அதற்குப் பின்னாலே மகமத் டொக்லக் முதலான எல்லோரும் வந்து கொஞ்சம் கொஞ்சமாக இந்துஸ்தானி, இந்தியானது. அயல் நாட்டு அரபு, உருது, பார்சி பதங்களோடு சமஸ்கிருத பதங்களும் சேர்ந்ததுதான் இந்தி. இது இல்லை என்று யாராவது மறுக்கமுடியுமா? இந்தி நமக்குச் சுதேசி மொழியா? நாட்டின் மொழியா? பிறநாட்டு மொழியைப் பின்பற்றி வந்த பரதேச மொழி. அப்படி இருக்க ஆங்கில மொழியை மட்டும் பரதேசமொழி என்று அதை அடியோடு ஒழிக்க வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுவது நீதிதானா? ஆங்கில வெறியன் அல்ல நான். ஆங்கில மோகமும் கிடையாது எனக்கு. ஆனால் ஆங்கிலம் எவ்வளவு அவசியம் என்பதை நினைத்துப்பார்க்க வேண்டும். ஆங்கிலம் இல்லாவிட்டால் அயல் நாட்டிலே, ஐரோப்பாவிலும் அமெரிக்காவிலும் வளர்ந்து வருகிற விஞ்ஞானத்துறை, தொழில்துறை, எல்லாவற்றையும்பற்றி நேரடி அறிவு நமக்கு எப்படி ஏற்படும்? நாம் இனிமேல் ஜெர்மன் படிக்கப் போகிறோமா? ரஷ்யமொழி படிக்கப்போகிறோமா? அல்லது ஜப்பானியமொழிதான் படிக்கப்போகிறோமா? இனிமேல் நாம் அயல்நாட்டு அறிவு பெறவேண்டுமானால் இங்கிலீஷ் ஒன்றுதான் அது முடியும். ஆகையினால் நான் குறிப்பிட்ட தலைவர் களையோ, கட்சியையோ குறித்துப் பேசவில்லை. எல்லாத் தலைவர்களும் அவரவர்களுக்குள் ஆலோசனை செய்து, இது நல்ல காரியமா என்று பார்த்து, இந்தி வரக்கூடாது என்று சொல்லுவது நியாயமா, ஆங்கிலம் ஒழியவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுவது நியாயமா என்று சொல்ல வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள் கிறேன். என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம் என்னவென்றால், நம்முடைய அரசாங்கம் செய்திருக்கிறபடி தமிழ் நாட்டில் தமிழே எல்லாத் துறைகளிலும் முதன்மை பெறவேண்டும். மற்ற ராஜ்யங் களுக்கும் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்துக்கும் இடையே இங்கிலீஷும் வெகுகாலம் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று நம் மந்திரிகள் தீர்மானம் செய்திருக்கிறார்களே அதை நான் அப்படியே ஆமோதிக் கிறேன். அந்தத் தீர்மானத்துக்குக் கல்வி அமைச்சர் அவர்களை மனதார வாழ்த்துகிறேன். இந்த வெகுகாலம் என்பது எவ்வளவு? 5 வருஷமா? 10 வருஷமா? 50 வருஷமா? நூறு வருஷமா? ஆயிரம் வருஷமா? நமக்குத் திருப்தி அளிக்கிறவரையிலே. நான் இறுதியாக அவர்களுக்குச் சொல்லுகிறேன். வெகு காலத்துக்கு இந்தியும் ஆங்கிலமும் ஆட்சி மொழிகளாக நீடிக்க வேண்டும் என்பதோடு நிறுத்திக்கொள்ளுங்கள். அதற்குப் பின்னால் 'இந்தி ஆங்கிலத்தை ஒழிக்கக்கூடியது' என்று தைடர் போட்டு இருக்கிறீர்களே அதெல்லாம் வேண்டாம்:—இந்தியும் ஆங்கிலமும் நாட்டு அரசாங்கத்தின் மொழியாக இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது— The Government of Madras desire to place before the Parliamentary Committee and the Government of India the view that it will be necessary to use both English and Hindi as two associate languages of the Indian Union for a prolonged period. ஆகவே எந்த வெகுகாலம் என்பது நமக்குத் தெரியாது.

ஆகையால் நான் சொல்லுவது மொழிவெறி அல்ல. இப்பொழுது அஸ்ஸாமில் நடந்ததும் பஞ்சாபிலும் மற்ற சில ராஜ்யங்களிலும் புகைந்துகொண்டிருக்கிற விஷயங்களைப் பார்த்தால் மத்திய அரசாங்கமாவது ராஜ்ய அரசாங்கமாவது இந்த மொழி விஷயத்தில் தாராள மனப்பான்மை இல்லாமலிருந்தால் பலவித மான குழப்பங்கள் ஏற்பட்டு, எதிர்ப்புகள் ஏற்பட்டு இந்த நாட்டின் ஐக்கியத்திற்கு உலை வைத்துவிடும். ஆகவே இந்தத் தீர் மானத்தையும் அறிக்கையையும் வரவேற்று வாழ்த்துகிறேன்.

SRI V. S. BALASUNDARAM : "தலைவர் அவர்களே, இப் பொழுது அரசாங்க அறிக்கைக்குப் பிறகு, மொழிப் பிரச்னை பற்றி சந்தேகம் எல்லாம் ஒருவாறு தீர்ந்து இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று நம்பினேன். நமது எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர்கள் அவர் களுக்குத் திருப்தி இல்லை. ஸ்ரீமான் நடராஜன் அவர்களுக்கும் கொஞ்சம் திருப்தி இல்லை, சில விஷயங்களிலே. எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர் ஸ்ரீ லக்ஷ்மணசாமி முதலியார் அவர்கள் ஆங்கிலம் இந்த இருபதாவது நூற்றாண்டு பூராவும் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொன்னார்கள். ஆனால் அவருக்கு என்ன பயம் என்றால் எல்லாவித மூக்கியமான ஆராய்ச்சிகள், நவீன மார்க்கெட்டுகள் எல்லாம் போய்விடும் என்ற பயம்தான். அவர் ஆங்கிலத்தையே குழந்தை யிலிருந்து கற்றவர். தாய் பாஷை வேறுக இருக்கலாம். இது வரையிலும் அதே பாஷையிலே பழகி அந்த மனப்பான்மை
5–10 p.m உடையவராக இருந்து வருவதாலே அவருக்கு அதை விடுவது என்றால் சுலபம் இல்லை. ஆனால் நான் ஒன்று சொல்லக்கூடும் அவருக்கு. இப்படியே இருந்து கொண்டிருந்தால் நம்முடைய பாஷையானது எப்பொழுதுதான் வளம் அடையும்? புதிய புதிய விஷயங்கள் எல்லாம் நம்முடைய தமிழ் பாஷையிலே எப்பொழுதுதான் வரும்? எப்பொழுதும் ஒரு தேவை இருந்தால்தான் அதை நாடிச் செய்வதற்கு வகை ஏற்படும். சரியான புத்தகங்கள்கூட இல்லை என்று அவர் சொன்னார். வாஸ்தவம். பி.ஏ. போன்ற பெரிய வகுப்புகளில் இனிமேல் தமிழிலேயே பாடங்களைப் போதிக்க வேண்டுமென்று திட்டமிடப் பட்டிருப்பதால் அதுபற்றி நாம் பயப்படவேண்டியதேயில்லை. இப்போது வெளிநாடுகளில்கூட அங்குள்ளவர்கள் தங்கள் காரியங்களை இங்கிலீஷ் இல்லாமலேயே நடத்திக்கொண்டு வரு வதைக் காண்கிறோம். ஜெர்மனி தேசத்தார் ஆங்கிலத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டுதான் தங்கள் காரியங்களை யெல்லாம் செய்து வருகின்றனர்? ஜெர்மனிக்கு நமது ஜனங்களைக்கூட அனுப்பு கிறோம். பிரான்ஸ் தேசம் விஞ்ஞானத்தில் முன்னேறியிருக்கிறது. ரஷியா தேசம் லயன்ஸில் முன்னணியில் இருக்கிறது. இந்த தேசங்களிலுள்ளவர்கள் எல்லாம் தங்கள் விஞ்ஞான காரியங்களை இங்கிலீஷை வைத்துக்கொண்டுதான் செய்துவருகின்றனர்?

SRI S. NATARAJAN: ரஷியாவிலும் ஜெர்மனியிலும் எல்லோரும் இங்கிலீஷ் படிக்கிறார்கள்.

24th August 1960]

SRI V. BALASUNDARAM. அது அவரவர்களுடைய இஷ்டத்தைப் பொறுத்தது. அங்கே யார் யார் இங்கிலீஷ் படிக்க விரும்புகிறார்களோ அவர்கள் அதைப்படிக்கலாம். நம் நாட்டில் உள்ளதுபோல எல்லோரும் இங்கிலீஷ் படிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற கட்டாயம் அங்கு இல்லை. அந்த நாடுகள் எல்லாம் உலகிலேயே மிகவும் முன்னேற்றம் அடைந்துவருகின்றன. நமது நாட்டில் எஞ்ஜினியரிங் கல்லூரி, மெடிகல் கல்லூரி முதலிய கல்லூரிகளுக்கு வேண்டிய புத்தகங்கள் இப்போது தமிழில் இல்லாமல் இருக்கக் கூடும். பெரிய விஞ்ஞான ஆராய்ச்சி சம்பந்தமான புத்தகங்கள் இப்போது தமிழில் இல்லாமல் இருக்கலாம். ஆனால், அவை நம் நாட்டில் இப்போது இல்லாமலிருந்தாலும், பி.எ. முதலிய பெரிய வகுப்புகளில் தமிழில் பாடம் கற்றுக் கொடுக்கும்பட்சத்தில் அவை தானாகவே வரும் என்பதில் சந்தேகமில்லை.

அடுத்தபடியாக, ஸ்ரீ. நடராஜன் 'மீடியம் ஆப் இன்ஸ்ட்ரக்ஷன்'-ஐப் பற்றிப் பேசினார். இப்போது பிள்ளைகளுக்கு தமிழில் போதிப்பதால் அவர்களுக்கு ஆங்கிலத்தில் தகுந்த தரம் இல்லை என்று அவர் சொன்னார். அதை நான் ஒருவாறு ஒப்புக் கொள்கிறேன். அவர்களுக்கு இப்போது ஆங்கில பாஷையில் தரம் இல்லாமல் இருக்கலாம். ஆனால், இப்போது எல்லாப் பாடங்களிலும் அவர்களுடைய அறிவு அதிகமாக வளர்ந்திருக்கிறது என்பதில் சந்தேகமில்லை. இதை யாரும் மறுக்க முடியாது. நான் பார்த்தமட்டில், முன்பு நமது பிள்ளைகள் பாடங்களில் விடைகள் எப்படிக் கொடுத்தார்களோ அதைவிட நன்றாக இப்போது நமது பிள்ளைகள் விடைகள் கொடுக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்வேன். கணக்காஞலும் சரி, சரித்திரமாஞலும் சரி, சயன்ஸ் ஆஞலும் சரி, எந்த பாடமாஞலும் பிள்ளைகளின் தரம் ஆங்கிலத்தில் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லலாமே தவிர, அவர்களுடைய அறிவு குறைவாக இல்லை. அவர்களுடைய அறிவு அதிகமாகித் தான் இருக்கிறது என்று ஸ்ரீ. நடராஜன் அவர்களுக்குத் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன். அவர் சொன்ன மாதிரி அவர்களுடைய தரம் ஆங்கிலத்தில் கொஞ்சம் குறைந்து இருக்கிறது. அது அப்படித்தான் இருக்கும். ஏனென்றால் ஆங்கிலம் இப்போது பள்ளிகளில் இரண்டாவதுபடியான பாடமாகத்தான் இருக்கிறது. இப்போது 'பர்ஸ்ட் லாங்க்வேஜ்' தமிழாகவும், 'செகண்ட் லாங்க்வேஜ்' ஆங்கிலமாகவும் இருக்கிறது. போதஞ்ஞாறை ஆங்கிலத்திலேயே இருந்துவந்தால், நாம் தமிழை எந்தக் காலத்தில் விருத்திசெய்வது? தமிழ் நாட்டில் தமிழுக்கு மிகவும் முக்கியத்துவம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறோம். அதை அரசியல் பாஷையாக ஆக்கியிருக்கிறோம். நாளாவட்டத்தில் கோர்ட்டுகளில்கூட தமிழ் பாஷை வந்துவிடும் என்பதில் சந்தேகமில்லை. ஆகையால் பிள்ளைகளுக்கு தமிழில் தரம் உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. நம் பிள்ளைகள் தமிழை முன்னைவிட நன்றாகப் படிக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய அறிவும் தமிழில் நன்றாக இருக்கிறது. எப்போது தமிழ் பாஷையில் அவர்களுடைய

அறிவும் தரமும் விருத்தியாகின்றனவோ அப்போது அவை ஆங்கிலத்தில் குறைந்து தான் இருக்கும். இப்போது நாம் செய்ய வேண்டியது, தமிழ் பாஷையை விருத்தி செய்வது ஆகும்.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

கூடியவரையில் ஆங்கில பாஷையும் தெரிந்திருக்க வேண்டும். அதனால்தான் பள்ளிக்கூடங்களிலும் மற்ற இடங்களிலும் தமிழுக்கு முக்கியத்துவம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. எனவே ஆங்கிலம் எப்போதும் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று எண்ணுவது வீண்தான். ஆங்கிலம் இன்னும் சில வருஷங்கள்தான் இருக்கும். எவ்வளவு அதிகமாகக் கணக்குப் போட்டாலும் இன்னும் 20, 30 வருஷங்களுக்குத் தான் ஆங்கிலம் இருக்கும். அதற்கு மேல் ஆங்கிலம் இருக்காது என்று தான் நான் நம்புகிறேன். இப்போது தமிழ் நன்றாக முன்னேறி வருகிறது. ஆங்கிலத்திற்கும் தகுந்த இடத்தைக் கொடுத்திருக்கிறோம். ஹிந்திக்கும் தகுந்த இடத்தைக் கொடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஸ்ரீ நடராஜன் அவர்களும் மற்றவர்களும் ஹிந்தியைத் திணிக்கிறோம் என்று சொன்னார்கள். ஹிந்தியைத் திணிப்பது என்றால் எனக்கு அர்த்தம் புரியவில்லை.

SRI S. NATARAJAN: ஹிந்தியை நீங்கள் திணிக்கிறீர்கள், என்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை; மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தார் திணிக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொன்னேன்.

SRI V. S. BALASUNDARAM: எந்தப் பையன் எந்தப் பாடத்தைப் படிக்கிறான்? பரீட்சையே வேண்டாம் என்று மாணவன் சொல்கிறான். பள்ளி மாணவனாக இருந்த காலத்தில் நானும் 'இந்தப் பரீட்சை ஏன்' என்று சொன்னதுண்டு. காரணம், படிப்பது கஷ்டமாக இருக்கிறது. நான் பள்ளிப் படிப்பை முடித்து இண்டர்மீடியட், பி. ஏ. வகுப்புகளுக்கு வந்த போது, மறுபடியும், "இவ்வளவு கடினமாகப் பரீட்சை வைத்திருக்கிறார்களே! இந்தப் பரீட்சை ஒழியக் கூடாதா" என்று எண்ணினேன். எனவே அது ஒழிய வேண்டும், இது ஒழிய வேண்டும், அது வேண்டாம், இது வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்வது சுலபம். இதையெல்லாம் திணிப்பதாக எடுத்துக்கொள்வதானால், ஹிந்தியையும் திணிப்பதாக எடுத்துக்கொள்ளலாம். ஆனால், பரீட்சையை திணிப்பது என்று சொல்வது சுலபமல்ல. கணக்கு சுலபமான பாடமா? கணக்குகள் போடுவது கஷ்டம். அந்தப் பாடத்தையெல்லாம் திணிப்பதாகச் சொல்கிறோமா? அதே மாதிரி, ஹிந்தி விஷயத்திலும் திணிக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லுவது சரியல்ல. எனவே நாம் எந்தப் பாடத்தையும் திணிக்கவில்லை. மற்றப் பாடங்களைப் போல ஹிந்திப் பாடமும் ஒன்று. 'ஆப்ஷன்'-க்கு இடம் கொடுக்கிறோம். ஹிந்தி, தெலுங்கு, மலையாளம், கன்னடம், உருது இவைகளில் எதாவது ஒரு பாஷையை

24th August 1960] [Sri V. S. Balasundaram]

எடுத்துக்கொள்ளலாம் என்று சொல்கிறோம். இப்போது ஹிந்தி வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்லும் பெரியோர்கள், ஹிந்தி வேண்டாம் என்றால், 'தெலுங்கு எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள்' என்று சொல்வது தானே? திராவிட நாடு வேண்டும் என்று சொல்பவர்கள், ஆந்திரம், கன்னடம், மலையாளம், தமிழ்நாடு ஆகிய ராஜ்யங்கள் எல்லாம் சேர்ந்தது திராவிட நாடு என்று சொல்கிறார்கள். ஹிந்தி வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்லும் அவர்கள், மானவர்கள் மலையாளத்தையோ, கன்னடத்தையோ, தெலுங்கையோ எடுத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சொல்வதுதானே? தமிழ்நாட்டில் தமிழர்களுக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய மொழிப் பற்றைப் பயன்படுத்திக்கொண்டு தங்கள் கட்சியை வலுப்படுத்திக்கொள்ளலாம், தங்கள் கட்சியை வளர்த்துக்கொள்ளலாம் என்ற எண்ணத்தில், அவர்கள் இங்கே ஹிந்தி வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே, மொழி விஷயத்தில் நாம் நமது அரசாங்கத்தின் கொள்கையை மனப் பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்க வேண்டுமென்று கனம் அங்கத்தினர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் வார்த்தையை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

* VIDWAN T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN: தலைவர் அவர்களே, நமது மதிப்பிற்குரிய கல்வி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் சென்னை அரசாங்கத்தின் ஆட்சி மொழிக் கொள்கையைப் பற்றிக் குறிப்பிட்டதை நான் மனமார ஆதரிக்கிறேன். நமது சென்னை அரசாங்க அமைச்சரவையினர் நமது தாய் மொழியாகிய தமிழ்மொழியைப் பற்றியும் ஹிந்தி மொழியைப் பற்றியும் ஆங்கிலத்திற்குரிய இடத்தைப் பற்றியும் என்ன கருத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றனர் என்பதைப் பற்றி, 'இந்தியாவின் மொழிப் பிரச்னை' என்ற நூலில் திட்டவட்டமாகக் கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. நமது ராஜ்ய அமைச்சரவையில் தாங்கள் தமிழ்நாட்டு மக்களின் உண்மையான பிரதிநிதிகள் என்ற பொறுப்புணர்ச்சியுடனும் கடமையுணர்ச்சியுடனும் மிக அழகாக பல சந்தர்ப்பங்களிலும் வாதாடி, தங்களுடைய கொள்கையை நிலைநாட்டியிருக்கிறார்கள். உதாரணமாக, ஹிந்தியை வற்புறுத்திப் பலாத்காரமாகத் திணிக்கக்கூடாது என்பதை நம்முடைய அரசாங்கத்தினர் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தினருக்கும் ஆட்சிமொழிக் குழுவினருக்கும் நன்றாக எடுத்துக் கூறியிருப்பது, இந்நூலில் 14-வது பக்கத்தில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஹிந்தி வழங்காத வட்டாரங்களிலுள்ள மக்களின் மனத்தில் "ஹிந்தி திணிப்பு" என்ற அச்சத்தையும், சந்தேகத்தையும் கழகத்தின் அறிக்கை உண்டாக்கி விட்டது என்பதை எடுத்துக்காட்டுவது சென்னை அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமையாகப் பட்டது" என்று அந்தப் பக்கத்தில் கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. பதினாறாவது பக்கத்திலே மாநில சட்ட மன்ற மொழி எதுவாக இருக்கவேண்டும் என்பதைத் தெளிவாக எடுத்துக் கூறி இருக்கிறார்கள். "மாநில சட்டமன்ற மொழியைப்பற்றி இந்த முடிவுக்கு வர என்ன அவசியம் என்று சென்னை அரசாங்கத்துக்கு விளங்கவில்லை. மாநில சட்டங்கள் அந்தந்த மாநில மக்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டது. அதற்கு அந்த மாநில மொழிதான் பயன்படுத்தப்பட வேண்டும். சட்டமன்ற மொழி மாநில ஆட்சி

5-20 p.m.

மொழியாகத்தான் இருக்கவேண்டும்" என்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். அடுத்தபடியாக, அயல்நாடு, மற்ற மொழிகளைப் பற்றிக் கூறுகிறபோது அதுபற்றி கமிஷன் கூறியுள்ளதாவது: மாற்றம் ஏற்படவேண்டிய காலம் வரும்போது பொது மொழியாக இருக்கவேண்டும் என்பதற்குக் காரணங்கள் பல இருக்கின்றன. திட்டவட்டமாக இந்த ராஜ்யமொழியாக இருக்க வேண்டும் என்று ஆணித்தரமாகக் கூறி இருக்கிறார்கள். எனவே நம்முடைய அமைச்சர்கள் தங்களுடைய மொழிக் கொள்கையைத் தெளிவாக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். அதை யாருமே மறைக்க முடியாது, மறக்கவும் முடியாது. வீணாக வெற்றுக் கூச்சல் போட்டு மக்களைக் குத்திக் கிளப்பி வெறி ஏறச்செய்வது உண்மையிலே வருந்தத்தக்கது.

நம்முடைய ராஜ்யம் மற்ற ராஜ்யங்களுக்கு வழிகாட்டியாக இருந்து வருகிறது. இந்த மொழிப் பிரச்னையிலே நம்முடைய ராஜ்ய அமைச்சர்கள் குறிப்பாகக் கல்வி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் மக்கள் கருத்தை நன்றாகத் தெரிவித்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது பெருமைப்படத் தக்கது. அடுத்தபடியாக ஒவ்வொருவருக்கும் தாய்மொழி உயிர்போன்றது. மனிதன் எப்படி உயிர் வாழ்வதற்குக் காற்றும் உணவும் இன்றியமையாததோ அப்படித்தான் அவன் பேசும் மொழியும் மிகமிக முக்கியமானது. மொழியை நினைக்கும்போது ஒவ்வொருவருக்கும் தன்மான உணர்ச்சி வரும். மொழியை எண்ணுகிறபோது எவனும் உள்ளத்தில் அன்பையும் ஆர்வத்தையும் கொள்ளுகிறான். என் தாய்மொழி என்ற அன்பும் ஆர்வமும் எழுகின்றன. முப்பத்தாறு கோடி மக்கள் வாழ்கின்ற இந்த நாட்டிலே பதிமூன்று கோடி மக்கள் கிட்டத்தட்ட இந்தி மொழி பேசுகிறார்கள். சுதந்திரம் அடைந்த பிறகு இந்த நாட்டிலே எத்தனையோ ராஜ்யங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. ஒவ்வொரு ராஜ்யத்திலும் வட்டார மொழியைத்தான் தாய் மொழியைத்தான் அரசாங்க மொழியாகக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதோடு நாடு இருக்கிறதே, சுதந்திரம் அடைந்த நாடு, அதற்கு ஒரு பொது மொழி வேண்டாமா, ஐக்கியத்தை ஏற்படுத்துவதற்கு ஒரு மொழி வேண்டாமா என்ற பிரச்னை எழுகிறது. நிச்சயமாக வேண்டியது தான். யாரும் மறுக்கமுடியாது. ஆனால் அது எந்த வழியிலே எத்தனை ஆண்டிலே செய்வது என்பதிலேதான் சிக்கல் ஏற்படுகிறது. வீணாக மாணவர்களுடைய மனது புண்படும் அளவிலே இந்த மொழியை வலிந்து கற்றுக் கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று எதிர் பார்த்தாலே அந்த மொழியின்மீது, இந்தி மொழியின்மீது, குறிப்பாக இந்தி வழங்காத பிரதேச மக்களுக்குக் கசப்பு உணர்ச்சி ஏற்பட்டு விட்டது. வெறுப்புணர்ச்சி ஏற்பட்டு விடுகிறது. அதற்காகத்தான் நாம் வருந்துகிறோம். பிறமொழியிடம் அன்பு காட்டவேண்டும். வேறுபாடான உணர்ச்சியையும் துர்அதிர்ஷ்டவசமாக எழுப்பி விட்டார்கள். இதற்கு காரணம் என்ன என்று பண்டித நேரு அவர்கள் நன்றாக கூறியிருக்கிறார்கள்; இது அவருடைய ஆட்சிமொழி பற்றிய உரையிலே தெளிவாக இருக்கிறது. "இப்படி மக்களுக்கு இந்தி மொழியின்

24th August 1960] [Vid wan T. Muthukannappan]

மீது வெறுப்பும் கசப்பும் ஏற்படுவதற்குக் காரணம் இந்த இந்தி மொழி பேசிக்கொண்டிருந்தவர்கள்தான்" என்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார். "இந்த மன்றத்திற்கும் முக்கியமாக ஹிந்தி பேசும் பகுதிகளிலுள்ள எனது சகாக்களுக்கும் நான் எடுத்துச்சொல்ல விரும்புவது என்னவென்றால் அவர்களது முயற்சியில் ஏதாகிலும் தடையிருக்கிறது என்றால், அளவுக்கு மேற்பட்ட உற்சாகமும் இந்த மொழிப் பிரசினை குறித்து அவர்கள் மேற்கொள்ளும் வழியும் தான் அந்தத் தடையாகும். இவை மற்றவர்களுக்கும் கோபம் மூட்டுகின்றன" என்று வருத்தத்தோடும் வேதனையோடும் அவர் கூறியிருக்கிறார். இது எப்படி இருக்கிறது என்றால், சும்மா இருக்கிற சங்கை ஊதிக்கெடுத்தான் ஆண்டி என்று சொல்லுவது போல் இருக்கிறது. இந்த மொழி வெறி சும்மா இருந்தவர்களின் எண்ணத்தையும்கூட மாற்றி வெறுப்புக் கொள்ளச் செய்திருக்கிறது. நாட்டிலே ஒரு பொது மொழி வேண்டியதுதான். இந்த நாட்டில் பொது மொழியாக பல மொழிகள் இருந்திருக்கின்றன. அந்த வகையிலே சமஸ்கிருதமும், பாரசீக மொழியும் பொது மொழியாக ஒரு காலத்திலே இருந்திருக்கின்றன என்று இவ்வறிக்கையே கூறுகிறது. தமிழ்மொழி வரலாற்றையும் சங்க இலக்கியங்களையும் பார்த்தால் சேர சோழ பாண்டியர் காலத்தில் ஒவ்வொரு மன்னரும் ஒரு சில ஆண்டுகள் ஒரு மொழி வைத்து உலகை அதாவது இந்நாடு முழுவதையும் ஆண்டிருக்கிறார் என்று தெரியும். அதற்குத் தக்க சான்றுகள் இருக்கின்றன. 'குமரி முதல் இமயம் வரை ஒரு மொழி வைத்துலகாண்டான் சேரலாதன்' என்று இலக்கியம் கூறுகிறது.

இந்தி மொழி, இந்தி பேசாத மக்களிடம் வந்தால் என்ன ஆகுமோ என்ற பயம் வந்துவிட்டது. காரணம் அவர்கள் அனுபவித்து இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆங்கிலேயர்கள் ஆண்டார்கள். ஆங்கிலம் ஆட்சி செலுத்தியது. தாய்மொழியின் வளம் குன்றி விட்டது. மகம்மதியர் ஆட்சியாலும் ஓரளவு பாதிக்கப்பட்டது. விஜயநகர மன்னர் ஆட்சியாலும் தமிழ் நசுக்கப்பட்டது. அப்படி இந்தி கண்டிப்பாகக் கற்கவேண்டும் என்று சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப்படுமானால், தமிழர்கள், சுதந்திரம் அடைந்து தமிழ் மொழி முன்போல் வளர ஆரம்பித்திருக்கும் இந்த நேரத்தில், வளம் குன்றிவிடுமோ என்று ஐயப்படுகிறார்கள். இந்த எண்ணத்துக்கு இடம் கொடுப்பது தவறு என்று கூறுகிறேன். "இந்தியைக் கண்டிப்பாகக் கற்கவேண்டும், அது ஆட்சி மொழியாக இருக்கவேண்டும்" என்று சொல்லுவதிலேதான் சங்கடம் வருகிறது. பல ராஜ்யங்களில் இருக்கிற மக்கள் ராஜ்யத்துக்கு ராஜ்யம் கடிதப் போக்கு வரத்து வைத்துக் கொள்ளவும், பேசிக்கொள்ளவும் ராஜ்ய மக்கள் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தோடு எழுத்து மூலமாகக் காரியங்கள் வைத்துக்கொள்ளவும். இந்தி பொதுமொழியாக இருக்கட்டும். அதை மறுக்கவில்லை. அதோடுகூட ஆங்கிலமும் படிக்கவேண்டும். ஆனால் நேருஜி சொல்லுவதுபோல், ஆங்கிலம் இப்பொழுது முதல் இடத்திலே இருக்கமுடியாது. தொழில் நுட்பக்கலை, விஞ்ஞானம் இவற்றில்

[Vidwan T. Muthukannappan] [24th August 1960

நம் நாடு சிறந்து விளங்க ஆங்கிலம் படிக்கத்தான் வேண்டும். ஆங்கிலத்தைத் தமிழ் மக்கள் எப்பொழுதுமே கற்கத்தான் வேண்டும்.

ஆகையினாலே என்னுடைய கருத்து தமிழ்மொழிதான், தாய் மொழிதான் அந்தந்த வட்டாரத்திலே, அந்தந்த ராஜ்யத்திலே பயிற்சி மொழியாக இருக்கவேண்டும். முதலாவதாக இருக்க வேண்டும். விஞ்ஞானம், தொழில் நுட்பக்கலை முதலியவற்றை அறிவதற்கு ஆங்கிலம் கற்கத்தான் வேண்டும். ஒரு பொது மொழி நாட்டுக்கு வேண்டியது என்ற முறையிலே, இந்தியைக் கற்க வேண்டும். ஆனால் திணிப்பது கூடாது.

5-30 p.m.

* Sri T. P. SRINIVASAVARADAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will try to be as brief as possible. The Hon. the Finance Minister first gave a detailed account of how Hindi came to be adopted as the official language of India. And then at the end of his speech he made a strong plea for unity. We are all for unity. It is because we want that India should be united, we are trying to solve the problem of the official language. But how can you unite India ? Is it by imposition of one language over other States or is it by adopting a policy of give and take ? It is the most important thing to consider. I must congratulate the Government on the strong fight they have put up all these years in the matter of the official language. It is only to strengthen the hands of the Government, I think the hon. Member Mr. Raza Khan has moved those amendments.

Sir, the lovers of Hindi are saying : 'Even before we achieved independence we had been saying, for forty years or so, that Hindi must be the official language and the national language. But nobody took that very seriously. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition gave an instance to prove that. He said that Mahatmaji himself once said that we need not learn or speak Hindi, but that doing the work was much more important than learning the language. That is the present condition of India. The reason why I say that is this. One of the Directive Principles of State Policy mentioned in the Constitution is that all boys and girls up to the age of 14 should be given free education before 1960. 1960 is practically over. We have not done what we aimed to do or what was directed by the Constitution. But what is it that we have actually done ? We say, under the Third Plan, i.e., during the years 1961–65, we would try to bring in children of the age group under 11 of the school and give them education up to fifth standard. (An hon. Member: Even then only 70 per cent of the boys of that age group are to be brought in.) Yes. That is our target. When such is the case even with regard to a directive principle contained in the Constitution why this undue haste so far as this official language is concerned? Kindly excuse my saying that it is the Official Language Commission that has marred the good feeling that existed in the country. It is the ruling party that has undone the goodwill that prevailed among the various States. You will excuse me if I say, it is because the States were divided on a linguistic basis much of this trouble has arisen. Now you find in Assam, they say the official language should be Assamese. The Bengalis, though they are in a minority, form a substantial minority. In Maharashtra, Kannadigas form a substantial minority. In the Madhya Pradesh you have on the one side Hindi-speaking people and on the other side Marathi-speaking

24th August 1960] [Sri T. P. Srinivasavaradan]

people. In Hyderabad you have Marathi, Kanarese and Telugu. So you will find there is no such thing as a compact linguistic group. But unfortunately it is the Government that created these feelings when they said that the States should be formed on a linguistic basis. All this has produced the apprehension in the minds of us all that Hindi would be imposed on us. If you read the report of the Language Commission, you will find that every sentence there breathes this feeling that Hindi will be imposed on us after 1965, whatever the conditions then prevailing. They themselves admit that considering the present position, the nation is not prepared to change over to Hindi. 'Unpreparedness'; that is the language used. When they themselves admit that, why should they think of imposing Hindi on us, after 1965? In regard to the language of the Supreme Court, they say they have to switch over to Hindi. In regard to High Courts, they are left to the States to be dealt with.

Sir, because we were all fighting for freedom then, we did not care much to take note of all these pronouncements as Hindi becoming the national language and so on. But one distinct thing you should note. English was never a national language. It is non-Indian they say. But even if Hindi becomes the official language, can it become the national language of India? It can be only an All India official language. It cannot reach the entire mass of people in the whole of India. If Hindi is imposed as an official language it can touch the masses only so far as the Hindi people are concerned. If you introduce Hindi in Madras State as the official language will it touch the masses here? Are you going to speak to our people here in Hindi? We are not going to do that. Therefore it cannot be called the national language. It can only be the official language as English has been and is. English has been the national language of the intelligents. So also Hindi will be. Therefore we should take note of this also before we proceed further in this matter of the official language. Even if Hindi is imposed on us, it will touch only the educated people and not the masses.

Sir, India has been one nation so far and I am really sorry to say after the formation of the States on a linguistic basis it has become a multi-linguistic nation. Otherwise it would have continued to be one nation. It has already been pointed out that Hindi is spoken only by 13 crores of people or only by about 33-1|3 per cent of the people living in India. The Hon. the Finance Minister pointed out how difficult it would be to include English as a national language. I am not particular about its being included in the list of national languages. But I want the continuance of English for a prolonged period as was pointed out by him.

There is one other difficult question about this and nobody referred to it. They want Hindi to be the official language. They want that education should be given through the medium of Hindi. Therefore there will be a section of people in the Central services who will know only Hindi and they will correspond only in Hindi. We want that the continuance of English should be prolonged, i.e., as long as we want and we will correspond in English, that is, our officers in the Secretariat will correspond in English. Therefore in the offices of the Central Government you will find one set of people corresponding in Hindi and another in English. How to reconcile these two sets of people, I am not able to understand. The Language Commission has stated that the States will correspond among themselves only in

[Sri T. P. Srinivasavaradan] [24th August 1960

Hindi. U.P. will correspond with M.P. in Hindi and M.P. can correspond with U.P. in Hindi. But what would be the language for purposes of correspondence between our State and other States. Why should you create all this confusion now?

Sir, about the study of the languages in schools, the Language Commission has stated that Hindi should begin at the end of the Primary stage. In the High School stage it should be made compulsory. In the University also it should be made compulsory if not now, at least some time later. They have stated that Hindi should be the medium of instruction. Luckily the Parliamentary Committee has diluted the recommendation and the Prime Minister has still further diluted it. However, the Commission has pointed out that due regard must be paid to industrial development and to scientific and technical education. Vut if you introduce Hindi as medium of instruction, all these will be hampered. There is no doubt about it. There is so much of industrial development now in our State. There has been so much development of power. I would request the Hon. Minister Sri Ramiah to tell me 'if he had only Hindi people without the background of the sciences, would he have developed electricity to the extent he has done?' Would there be so much of scientific development, industrial development and cultural development? We, therefore, want English to continue for a long time to come. Let us not shut our eyes to this fact. 'Let us not be linguistic enthusiasts or fanatics' was the appeal made to us. But I say if there is any language fanaticism anywhere, it is there in the Hindi States and among the Hindi-speaking people. It is they who are fanatics and who are arrogant also so far as the language issue is concerned.

* SRI N. ANNAMALAI PILLAI: கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்த மொழிபற்றிய விவாதத்தில் கலந்துகொண்டு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். மற்றவர்கள் ஹிந்தியைப் படிப்பதினால் இங்கிலீஷ் படித்தவர்களுக்கு பாதகம் ஏற்படும் என்று சிலர் நினைக்கிறார்கள். இங்கிலீஷ் படித்தவர்களுக்கு ஒரு பயம் தோன்றியிருக்கிறது. அந்த பயம் என்னவென்றால், ஹிந்தி வந்துவிட்டால் தாங்கள் ஆங்கிலத்தை உபயோகிக்க முடியாத நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டு விடுமோ, தாங்கள் ஹிந்தியை எப்படிப் படிக்க முடியும் என்று அவர்கள் எண்ணுகிறார்கள். ஒரு பி. எல். படிக்கும் மாணவன் இத்தகைய பயத்தை என்னிடம் வெளியிட்டு, "நான் எவ்வாறு என் வாழ்நாளை நடத்துவது" என்று கேட்டான். அப்போது நான் "உன் போன்றவர்களுடைய படிப்புக்கு யோக்கியதை இல்லாமல் போகாது. அதற்கெல்லாம் இடம் கொடுப்பார்கள்" என்று சொன்னேன். இந்த சபையில் இந்த விவாதத்தில் ஆங்கிலம் படித்தவர்கள் பேசினார்கள். ஆங்கிலப் பாடத்தைப் பொறுத்தவரையிலும், அதைப் போதிக்கலாம் என்று தமிழ் நாட்டிலுள்ள ஜனங்கள் அத்தனை பேரும் அங்கீகாரம் தெரிவித்திருக்கிறார்களா, அல்லது ஆங்கில பாஷையை நீங்கள் திணிக்கிறீர்களா? தமிழ்நாட்டில் உள்ள மொத்த ஜனத்தொகை மூன்று கோடி. இவர்களில் உயர்ந்த படிப்புப் படித்தவர்களின் எண்ணிக்கை இரண்டு அல்லது மூன்று லட்சத்திற்கு மேல் இருக்காது. இந்த இரண்டு அல்லது மூன்று லட்சம் பேர் மற்றவர்கள் எல்லோரையும் பார்த்து, "நீங்கள்

5-40 p.m.

24th August 1960] [Sri N. Annamalai Pillai]

இங்கிலீஷ் கற்றுக்கொள்ளுங்கள்" என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள்; "நாங்கள் இங்கிலீஷில் பேசி வழக்காடுகிறோம், நாங்கள் இங்கிலீஷில் பேசி உங்களுக்கு வேண்டியதை வாங்கிக் கொடுக்கிறோம்" என்று இவர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இங்கிலீஷ் படித்தவர்கள் இவ்வாறு சொல்லும்போது, இதற்கு மற்றவர்கள் சிலர் "ஆமாம், ஆமாம்" என்று தலையாட்டுகிறார்கள்.

நான் ஐவ்வாது மலையிலுள்ள ஒரு பையனை பி.ஏ. வரை படிக்கச் செய்தேன். படிக்க வேண்டும் என்று நான் அவனிடம் அடிக்கடி சொல்லிச் சொல்லி, அவனை பி.ஏ. வரை படிக்கச் செய்தேன். அவன் பி.ஏ. வரை படித்துவிட்டான். அவனுக்கு இப்போது வேலை இல்லை. அவனுக்கு யார் வேலை வாங்கிக் கொடுப்பார்கள்? ஐவ்வாது மலையிலுள்ள அவன் மலைக்குக் கீழே இருப்பவர்களுடன் தொடர்பு கொள்ள முடியாது. படித்தவர்கள் இப்போது பயம் கொள்வதற்குக் காரணம் என்ன? கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஸ்ரீ. ஸ்ரீனிவாசவரதன் இந்த விவாதத்தில் பேசினர். அவருக்கு என்ன பயம்? அவருக்கு பயம் இருக்கக் காரணம் என்ன? அவர் உபாத்தியாயர் வேலை பார்த்தார். அவர் பல பிள்ளைகளுக்குப் பாடம் சொல்லிக் கொடுத்தார். காட்டில் இருப்பவனுக்கு யார் சொல்லிக் கொடுக்கிறார்கள்? அங்கே உள்ளவர்களுக்கு யாரும் சொல்லிக்கொடுப்பதில்லை. அங்குள்ளவர்கள் பள்ளிக்கூடத்திற்குப் போவதில்லை. அங்கே பள்ளிக்கூடத்திற்குப் போகிறவனுக்கும் ஆதரவு இல்லை.

ஹிந்தி பாஷை சாதாரண பாஷை. இந்த ஊரில் கொம்பப் பேர் ஹிந்தி பேசுகிறார்கள். இங்கிலீஷை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், யார் இங்கிலீஷ் பேசுகிறார்கள்? நான் புரண்டு, புரண்டு, மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டு இங்கிலீஷ் படிக்கிறேன், அது எனக்கு வரவில்லை. ஹிந்தியை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், பலர் ஹிந்தி பேசுகிறார்கள். கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஸ்ரீ. ஹமீத் கான் அவர்களுக்கு ஹிந்தி தெரியும். நான் ஹிந்தி தெரிந்தவரிடம் आप कहाँ जाते है? (ஆப் கஹாம் ஜாதே ஹைம்) என்று கேட்டால் அவர் मै उधर जाता हूँ (மை உதர் ஜாதா ஹூம்) என்று சொல்லுவார். அவரை உட்காரச் சொல்லுவதற்கு बैठिये (பைடியே) என்று சொல்லுவேன். எனவே ஹிந்தி சமீபத்தில் இருக்கிறது. இப்படி சமீபத்தில் இருப்பவர்கள் ஹிந்தி பேசும்போது, ஹிந்தியைத் திணிப்பதாக சிலர் சொல்கிறார்கள். தபால் ஆபீசில் இரண்டு வார்த்தைகள் ஹிந்தி போட்டிருக்கலாம். மைல் கற்களில் எங்கேயாவது ஹிந்தி போட்டிருக்கலாம். இதைப் பார்த்துவிட்டு இப்படி காபுரா அடைந்தால் இந்த தேசம் உருப்படவே உருப்படாது, கொம்ப மோசமான நிலையை அடைவோம். இந்த தேசத்துக்கு ஒரு தேசீய பாஷை வேண்டுமென்று கொக்கரித்துக் கொண்டிருந்தவர்கள் எல்லோரும் இப்போது ஹிந்தி ஒழிக, ஹிந்தி ஒழிக என்று சொல்ல ஆரம்பித்துவிட்டார்கள். இது கொம்பவும் அந்நியாயமானது. இங்கிலீஷ் இருக்கிறதே, அதை யார்தான் திணித்தார்கள் என்று ஒரு கனம் அங்கத்தினர் சொன்னார். அது இருந்துவருகிறது. அதைத் திணித்தார்கள் என்று யார் சொல்கிறார்கள்? சுமார் 50 வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்பு நான் பள்ளிக்கூடத்தில் படித்த காலத்தில்,

"இங்கிலீஷ் பரங்கி பாஷை, அதைப் படிக்காதே" என்று சொல்லி என் அம்மா என் கையைப் பிடித்து வீட்டுக்கு அழைத்துக் கொண்டு வந்துவிட்டார்கள். (சிரிப்பு.) என்னுடைய இங்கிலீஷ் படிப்புக்கு அப்போதே 'புல் ஸ்டாப்' வைத்துவிட்டார்கள். ஆகவே அந்த பாஷையைத் திணிக்கவில்லை. அது வந்திருக்கிறது. "உங்களுக்கு எல்லாம் தமிழில் வேண்டுமென்றால் ஆங்கிலேயர்களே இந்த நாட்டைவிட்டு விரட்ட வேண்டும்" என்று கர்ஜனை செய்தோம். ஸ்ரீ சுப்ரமணிய பாரதியார், மகாத்மா காந்திஜீ, ஸ்ரீ. வல்லபாய் படேல், ஸ்ரீ. விட்டல்பாய் படேல், ஸ்ரீ. மோதிலால் நேரு, ஸ்ரீ. ஜவஹர்லால் நேரு முதலியவர்களெல்லாம், ஆங்கிலேயர்களே இந்நாட்டை விட்டு வெளியேற்ற வேண்டும் என்று சொன்னார்கள். ஸ்ரீ. டி. பிரகாசம், ஸ்ரீ. நாகேஸ்வர ராவ் பந்துலு முதலியவர்கள் "மாகு ஒத்து தெள்ள துரைத்தனமு" என்று பாடினார்கள். அப்படிப் பாடி இங்கிலீஷ்காரர்களே இந்த நாட்டை விட்டு வெளியேற்றிவிட்டு இப்போது, இங்கிலீஷ் பாஷை வேண்டும் என்று சொன்னால் என்ன அர்த்தம்? ஏதோ, இங்கிலீஷ் ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட காலம் வரை இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொன்னாலும் பரவாயில்லை. அது நீடித்து இருக்கவேண்டும். அது சிரஞ்சீவியாக இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்வது மிகவும் தவறு.

இன்னொன்று சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த ராஜ்யத்துக்கு தமிழ் பாஷை ரொம்ப முக்கியமானது. அது இந்த ராஜ்யத்தினருக்கு தாகை வந்துவிடும். இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் தாய் குழந்தைக்குப் பால் கொடுக்கும்போதே குழந்தைக்குத் தமிழைச் சொல்லிக் கொடுக்கிறாள். அதை அம்மா சொல்லிக் கொடுக்கிறாள், பையன் கற்றுக்கொள்கிறான். எனவே தமிழை இந்த ராஜ்ய மக்களுக்குக் கற்றுக்கொடுக்க அதிக முயற்சி எடுக்க வேண்டியதில்லை. தமிழ் போகவே போகாது. தமிழ் போய்விட்டது என்று சொல்வது பிறரை ஏமாற்றுவதற்காகச் சொல்லப்படும் பேச்சு. இந்த ராஜ்ய மக்கள் பிறக்கும்போதே கற்றுக்கொள்ளும் பாஷை தமிழ் பாஷை. பிறக்கும்போது கற்றுக்கொள்ளாத பாஷையாகிய இங்கிலீஷ் போய்விடும். நம் தேச பாஷைகளில் ஒரு பாஷையாகிய ஹிந்தி பாஷையை சேர்த்துக்கொள்வோம் என்றால் ஆட்சேபணைகள் கிளப்புகிறார்கள். இங்கிலீஷில் பேச வேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்படும்போது டிரான்ஸ்லேட்டரை வைத்துக்கொள்ளலாம். ரஷியத் தலைவர்களும், சீனத் தலைவர்களும் நமது நாட்டிற்கு வந்திருந்தபோது அவர்கள் தங்கள் பாஷையில்தான் பேசினார்கள். அவர்கள் ரஷிய பாஷையிலும், சீன பாஷையிலும் பேசினார்கள். அவர்கள் மொழிபெயர்ப்பாளர்களே வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தார்கள். அவர்கள் பேசியதை மொழிபெயர்ப்பாளர் மொழி பெயர்த்தார். அம்மாதிரி நாமும் மொழிபெயர்ப்பாளர் வைத்துக்கொள்ளலாம். இந்த தேசத்து பாஷை நமது ஜனங்களுக்கு வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்வது நியாயமல்ல. டாக்டர் ஏ. எல். முதலியார் போன்றவர்கள் இந்த விஷயத்தில் இவ்வளவு தீவிரமாகப் பேசுவார்கள் என்று நான் எதிர்பார்க்கவில்லை. அவர்கள் அவ்வாறு பேசியதற்குக் காரணம் அவர்கள் இங்கிலீஷில் அதிகம் படித்திருப்பது

24th August 1960] [Sri N. Annamalai Pillai]

தான். "ஹிந்தி வந்தால் இங்கிலீஷில் அதிகப் படிப்புப் படித்துள்ள நமக்கு பாதகம் ஏற்பட்டுவிடுமோ" என்று அவர்கள் பயப்படுகிறார்கள். அப்படி பயப்பட வேண்டிய தில்லை. எல்லோரையும் காப்பாற்ற ஈசன் இருக்கிறான். நாம் கடவுளால் படைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம். கடவுளால் படைக்கப்பட்டுள்ள நாம் கடவுளால் பாதுகாக்கப்படுவோம் என்று நினைத்து நல்ல காரியத்தைச் செய்ய முன்வரவேண்டும் என்று எல்லோரையும் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். இத்துடன் என் வார்த்தையை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன். 5-50 p.m.

*SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER: மன்றத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, "இந்தியாவின் மொழிப் பிரச்னை" என்ற குறிப்பிலே வெகு நுணுக்கமாக நமது அரசாங்கம் பிரச்னையை அலசிப் பேசி இருக்கிறது. ஆதலின் அந்நுணுக்கங்களைப் பற்றி இப்பொழுது நான் விரிவாகச் சொல்லப் போவதில்லை. "மொழிவாரி ராஜ்யம் வந்ததாலே நாட்டிலே பெரும் பிரிவினைச் சக்திகள் எல்லாம் தலைவிரித்து ஆடுகின்றன; இது ஒரு பெரிய இமயமலை போன்ற தப்பு (Himalayan blunder)" என்றெல்லாம் சொல்லப்பட்டது. அந்தந்த மாகாணத்திலே இருக்கிறவர்கள் அவரவர்கள் ராஜ்யத்தை மொழிவாரி அடிப்படையில் நிர்ணயிக்க வேண்டும் என்பது இயற்கையாக ஏற்பட்ட ஒரு எண்ணம். அந்த எண்ணம் நெடுநாளைக்குப் பிறகு நிறைவேறி இருக்கிறது. அது சரியான எண்ணமாக இல்லாமல் இருக்கலாம். அதை இனிமேல் மாற்ற முடியுமா? திருப்பித் திருப்பி அதையே பேசிக் கொண்டிருந்தால் பயன் உண்டா? மொழிவாரி ராஜ்யங்கள் வந்துவிட்டன. அதை இனிமேல் மாற்றவே முடியாது. மொழி வாரி ராஜ்யங்கள் வந்தும் இந்தியா சிதறுண்டு போகாமல் ஒரு யூனியனை இணைக்கப்பட்டிருப்பது நம்முடைய நல் வினைப் பயனே ஆகும். இனிமேல் திருப்பித் திருப்பி அந்த பழைய பல்லவியைப் பாடிக்கொண்டிருப்பதைவிடப் பிரிவினைச் சக்திகளை எப்படித் தவிர்ப்பது என்பதைப்பற்றித்தான் இனிமேல் சிந்திக்க வேண்டும்.

பள்ளிக்கூடங்களிலும், கல்லூரிகளிலும், ஆங்கிலம் போதனை மொழியாக இல்லாவிட்டால் அதனுடைய தரம் குறைந்துவிடும். நம்மிடையே; ஆங்கில ஞானம் வரவரக் குறைந்து நம்முடைய முற்போக்கு நின்றுவிடும் என்றும், ஸ்தம்பித்து விடும் என்றும் சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த நேரத்திலே நாம் இந்த முறையில் ஆங்கிலத்தின் தரத்தை நிலை நிறுத்த இயலுமா? ஆங்கிலத்தின் போதனை நிலையை உயர்த்து வதற்கு வேறு ஏதேதோ வழிகள் தேடிக்கொள்ளமுடியும். ஆனால் அதைத் தொடர்ந்து போதனை மொழியாக நம் பள்ளிகளிலும், கல்லூரிகளிலும் வைத்துக்கொள்ளுவதிலேயே அதன் தரத்தை உயர்த்த முடியுமா அல்லது வேறு வழிவகைகள் உண்டா என்பதைப்பற்றி ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்கவேண்டும். அதற்கான வேறு வழிகளை எல்லாம் இந்தக் குறிப்பும் சொல்லியிருக்கிறது.

அதன் தரம் உயர ஆங்கிலம் நன்றாகக் கற்றுக்கொடுக்கப்பட வேண்டும். கல்லூரிகளிலும்கூட வரையறுக்கப்படாத காலத்துக்கு ஆங்கிலமே போதனை மொழியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பது மாணவர்களுக்கு நன்மை பயக்குமா? அல்லது தீமை பயக்குமா? தமிழ் மொழியைக் கல்லூரிகளிலும் போதனை மொழியாக நெடு நாளைக்கு முன்னரே ஏற்றுக்கொண்டு செயல் படுத்தியிருக்க வேண்டும். நம்முடைய தலைமுறையிலாவது கொண்டுவருவது நலம். அதற்குத் தரம் வரவில்லை என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு இருந்தால் அது நெடு நாளைக்கு அப்படியேத்தான் இருந்து கொண்டு இருக்கும். நீரில் இறங்கித்தான் நீந்தும் கலையைக் கற்றுக் கொள்ள முடியும். அதே போல தமிழை முதலில் போதனை மொழியாகக் கொண்டால்தான், அம்மொழியில் பாடப் புத்தகங்கள், சார்பு நூல்கள், மொழி பெயர்ப்புகள் சஞ்சிகைகள் நிறைய வெளிவர ஹேதுவாகும். மொழி வளம்பெற வழி வகைகள் செய்து அதன் தரத்தை உயர்த்த முடியும் எல்லா நுணுக்கங் களையும் தேடிக்கொள்ளமுடியும். விஞ்ஞானம் முதற்கொண்டு எல்லாப் பாடங்களும் தமிழிலே விரைவிலே வரவேண்டியது தான்.

இப்பொழுது முக்கியமான சர்ச்சை; இந்த இந்தி, ஆங்கிலம் இரண்டும் அரசாங்க அலுவலகங்களிலே எத்தகைய இடம் பெற வேண்டும். 1965-ம் ஆண்டு ஜனவரி 26-ம் தேதிக்குப் பின்னர், ஆங்கிலம் ஒரு துணை மொழியாகத்தான் இருக்கும், இந்தி முதல் மொழியாகிவிடும் என்பது பலருடைய அச்சம். இதை இந்திய அரசியல் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தாமலே 1965 ஜனவரி 26-ம் தேதிக்குப் பின்னரும் இன்றைய நிலைமையை நீடிக்க வைக்க முடியுமா அல்லது சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தித்தான் ஆகவேண்டுமா என்பதுதான் நம் சிந்தனையைக் கிளறிவிட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கும் விஷயம். ஆனால் இந்தத் திருத்தம் செய்வதற்கும்கூட 2/3 மெஜாரெட்டி அல்லது 3/4 மெஜாரெட்டி வேண்டி இருக்குமே என்று அச்சங் கொண்டு, இந்தத் திருத்தத்தைச் செய்ய காலம் கடத்திக்கொண்டு போவதைவிட அந்தத் திருத்தம் செய்யவும் இதுதான் நல்ல சந்தர்ப்பம், தக்க தருணம். வருங்காலத்தில் மனித குலமே ஒன்று பட்டு உலகக் குடிமக்கள் (World Citizens) ஆக வேண்டிய நிலைமையில் இந்தியை ரோமன் ஸ்க்ரிப்டிலேயே (Roman Script) படிப்பது நல்லதல்லவா? அப்படிக் கற்றுக்கொள்ளுவது சுலபமாக இருக்கும் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். நம் கல்வி அமைச்சரும் அதையே சொல்லி வருகிறார். அதே மாதிரி இந்தி மைல் கல்லைப்பற்றிப் பலபேர் பேசினார்கள். இது ஒரு பெரிய தலைவலியாக இருக்கிறது, சில பேருக்கு. ஏதோ புது எண்களைக் கொண்டு கஷ்டப்படுவதைவிட சர்வதேச எண்களையே (International numerals) வைத்துக்கொள்ள அரசியல் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தி விட ஏற்பாடு செய்வது நல்லதல்லவா? இந்த நல்ல தருணத்தைச் சென்னை மாநில அரசாங்கம் கை நழுவவிடக்கூடாது என்றே நினைக்கிறேன். இந்த மாநிலத்திலே ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் கிளர்ச்சி,

24th August 1960] [Sri K. M. Ramasamy Gounder]

இங்கு இந்தி வந்து, அது திணிக்கப்பட்டு, அகில இந்திய மொழியாக நாளா வட்டத்திலே அது வளர்ந்து, வளம் பெறுவதாலே, தமிழ் மொயிழின் வளர்ச்சி தடைபடுமே என்ற அச்சங்கொண்டு இந்திக்கு எதிர்ப்புக் கொடுப்பது தவிர்க்கப்பட வேண்டாமா? அந்த எதிர்ப்பைக் போக்குவது மேலே சொன்ன சீர்திருத்தங்களைக் கொண்டு வருவதால்தான் முடியும். பிரதம மந்திரி, ஜனதிபதி, இன்னும் மத்திய உள்விவகார மந்திரி அத்தனைபேரும் இணங்கி வருகின்ற இங்கிதமாக இருக்கிற, இந்த நல்ல சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே அரசியல் சட்டத்திலே ஏற்ற திருத்தங்களைக் கொண்டு வர நமது அரசாங்கம் முனைந்து பாடுபட்டு அதற்கு வழி வகை செய்யவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now adjourn and meet again at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned.

IV.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* 167. *Notification issued with G.O. No.* 1982, *Revenue, dated* 22*nd April* 1960, *exempting the sales of vegetable seeds, fruit plants, flower seeds and flower plants from the tax payable under the Madras General Sales Tax Act,* 1959.

* 168. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 2506, *Revenue, dated* 7*th June* 1960, *under the Madras Entertainment Tax Act,* 1939.

* 169. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 1764, *Revenue, dated* 5*th April* 1960, *exempting the sales of vegetables, fresh fruits, betel and plaintain leaves, flowers, eggs, meat and fish (other than canned meat and fish) and the purchases of potatoes from the tax payable under the Madras General Sales Tax Act,* 1939.

* 170. *Notification issued with G.O. No.* 1963, *Revenue, dated* 21*st April* 1960, *exempting the sales of products of country oil chekkus and hand oil presses from the tax payable under the Madras General Sales Tax Act,* 1959.

* 171. *Annexure to the Madras General Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill,* 1960.

* 172. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 3008, *Industries, Labour and Co-operation (Industries), dated* 20*th June* 1960, *regarding amendments to the Madras Small Scale and Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidiary Rules,* 1956.

** 173. *Report and Proceedings of the Committee of Privileges on the definition of the term "precincts of the House (Council)."*

*** 174. *Notification issued with G.O. No.* 665, *Local Administration, dated* 12*th April* 1960, *regarding declaration of Panchayat Development Blocks and constitution of Panchayat Unions in North Vellore Development District under section* 7 (3) *of the Madras Panchayats Act,* 1958.

*** 175. *Notification issued with G.O. No.* 669, *Local Administration, dated* 12*th April* 1960, *regarding declaration of Panchayat Development Blocks and constitution of Panchayat Unions in Chingleput Development District under section* 7 (3) *of the Madras Panchayats Act,* 1958.

*** 176. *Notification issued with G.O. No.* 670, *Local Administration, dated* 12*th April* 1960, *regarding declaration of Panchayat Development Blocks and constitution of Panchayat Unions in East Coimbatore Development District under section* 7 (3) *of the Madras Panchayats Act,* 1958.

---

* *Laid on the table of the House on* 22*nd August* 1960.

** *Laid on the table of the House on* 13*th August* 1960.

*** *Laid on the table of the House on* 23*rd August* 1960.

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 59 asked by Dr. A. Chidambaranathan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 24th August 1960, page 5 supra.]

Scheme of the Public Examination at the end of the course in the X Standard.

Languages.

Part I—Regional Language.—There shall be two papers each of two and a half hours duration and each carrying 100 marks.

First Paper will be set on the prescribed texts in Prose and Poetry and Grammar; the Second Paper on prescribed books for non-detailed study (essays), precis-writing, composition including drafting documents and translation, etc. The drafting of documents will include writing of letters. The distribution of marks will be as follows :—

Paper I.

	Marks.
Poetry Text	50
Prose Text	30
Grammar	20
Total ..	100

Paper II.

	Marks.
Essays on the Non-detailed books prescribed. (Two essays carrying 20 marks.)	40
Precis-writing	15
Original composition including drafting documents.	20

Translation.

English to Language	10
Language to English	15
Total ..	100

Part II—Hindi or any other Indian language not included in Part I.—There shall be one paper of two hours' duration carrying 50 marks.

Part III—English.—There shall be two papers, each of two and a half hours' duration and the papers and the distribution of marks will be exactly on the pattern adopted for the S.S.L.C. Public Examination of 1961.

General Mathematics.—There shall be one paper of two and a half hours' duration, carrying 100 marks. The paper and the distribution of marks will be exactly on the pattern adopted for the existing S.S.L.C. Public Examination.

Composite Mathematics.—There shall be one paper of two and a half hours' duration, carrying 100 marks. The paper and the distribution of marks will be exactly on the pattern adopted for the existing S.S.L.C. Public Examination.

General Science.—There shall be one paper of two and a half hours' duration, carrying 100 marks. The paper and the distribution of marks will be exactly on the pattern adopted for the existing S.S.L.C. Public Examination.

Social Studies.—There shall be one paper of two and a half hours' duration, carrying 100 marks. The distribution of marks will be as follows :—

	Marks.
History	50
Geography	50
Total ..	100

Both in History and Geography there will be short answer questions in about the same proportion as in Mathematics and Science.

Diversified Courses.

Engineering—

Paper I ..	Science ..	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Paper II	General Engineering.	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Paper III ..	Engineering Drawing.	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Paper IV ..	Workshop practicals.	3 hours ..	100 marks.

Textile Technology—

Science	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Textile Technology I	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Textile Technology II	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Textile Technology—Practical	3 hours ..	100 marks.

Agriculture—

Theory	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
General Science (same as for Academic Course).	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Practical	3 hours ..	100 marks.

Secretarial Course.

Typewriting—

Paper I	15 minutes.	35	
Paper II	1¾ hours	45	100 marks.
Paper III—Mechanism ..		20	

24th August 1960]

Shorthand—

Paper I—Dictation	8 minutes ..	
Transcription of the same into longhand.	1 hour ..	70 marks.
Paper II—Principles	1½ hours ..	30 marks.
Secretarial Practice	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
Book-keeping	2½ hours ..	100 marks.

Commercial Geography and Civics—(2½ hours).—

Commercial Geography ..	70	100 marks.
Civics	30	

Home Science—

Standard X	Theory ..	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
	Practical ..	3 hours ..	100 marks.

Drawing and Painting—

Standard X	Drawing ..	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
	Painting ..	2½ hours ..	100 marks,

Music—

Standard X	Theory ..	2½ hours ..	100 marks.
	Practical ..	3 hours ..	100 marks.

It was further decided that there shall be a separate paper each in Regional Language and English for all Diversified course pupils as mentioned below :—

Regional Language.

	(2-1|2 hours duration.)
Poetry	50
Prose	30
Composition	20
Total ..	100

English.

	(2-1|2 hours duration.)
Prose	30
Grammar	10
Non-detailed	30
Precis-writing	10
Composition	20
Total ..	100

The examinations to be held at the end of the X Standard (both Academic ond Diversified courses) will cover only portions of subjects done in the IX and X Standards.

III.—DISCUSSION ON THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE POLICY—*cont*

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I think, I should apologise for my absence during the latter part of the debate. But I may assure hon. Members that I have been fully briefed with reference to the speeches made by hon. Members here during my absence.

Sir, on the whole I am happy that the debate in this House has made a contribution in approaching this problem in quite a practical way and also in creating an atmosphere in the country which would be conducive to the settlement of this vexed question. The first point which every hon. Member emphasized here was the basic unity of the country. I am particularly happy about it. If we approach this problem from that basic idea of the unity of the country, even though there might be differences in the approach, I have no doubt in my mind that it would be possible to arrive at a solution which would be acceptable to the entire country. It is so not only with reference to the language problem. Even with reference to the economic problems, with reference to the industrial problems, with reference to the cultural problems and the various other problems which might arise, if we have this central idea in our mind, it is possible, Sir, to satisfy even the regional aspirations and the regional requirements also. Sometimes it is felt that these two are contradictory or conflicting. In my view it is not conflicting, but one is complementary to the other because in my view the unity of the country cannot be maintained and the emotional integration of the country cannot happen unless these regional aspirations and regional requirements are squarely met. And, Sir, the regional aspirations and the regional requirements cannot be squarely met unless we have a united India and the planning is done for the whole of the country, and all the resources available in a big country such as ours are utilized to the best advantage possible. Therefore, in my view—and that is the Government policy also—we have to work out the requirements of the various regions keeping in mind that only a united India will provide sufficient strength in the present world context to make development at a fast pace possible and at the same time meet the various needs of the different regions of this vast country.

Sir, from that point of view, if you look at the language problem also you will find that this is a country where many languages are spoken. Even the Constitution recognizes as many as 14 languages as the main languages of India. In addition to these, there are many more languages which are spoken in India even though by small sections of the people. It has now been recognized that these languages which have not been mentioned in the Constitution, and the fourteen languages mentioned in the Constitution, are national languages. No particular language has been given the status of *the* national language. We have got many national languages and, therefore, they are all entitled to equal status in treatment inside our country. If we realize this fact, then the other aspect of what language we should have for purposes of administration at the State level and what language we should have at the Union level becomes a matter of convenience for us to decide. It is from that aspect that we approach the problem at the various stages of considering the language problem of India. It is only after a consideration of these aspects, we decided, as far as we are concerned, to recommend to the Language Commission and later on to the Parliamentary Committee, to adopt the bilingual formula. Therefore, we have taken the

11-20 a.m. decision, taking all these into consideration, that Hindi and English should be the languages available for administrative purposes at the Union level. Whether we like it or not, we have given the status, as far as Hindi is concerned, not of the national language, but of the language of administration at the Union level. Therefore, after having agreed to this formula, there is no use of adopting the attitude that Hindi is outcast, 'I would not look at it; I would not even touch it'. This would only create difficulties for our own future generation. I refer to the future generation because it is not as if every one in our country would later on become proficient or would choose to become proficient only in English. A particular individual may choose to become proficient in Hindi and become qualified to participate in the Central administrative apparatus. Some people talked about *status quo*. *Status quo* for whom? For those who have already learnt the English language and come out of the schools and educational institutions. There is no question of their studying anything else hereafter except as a hobby. Therefore, the *status quo* is only for those of us who are present here now—I may mention not the Council but the country—who have undergone training in English. For the future generation, there should be free choice either to learn English—as long as bilinguism is adopted—or to learn Hindi and participate in the Central administration at Delhi. Sir, this aspect will have to be kept in mind. At the same time we have also to keep in mind the various other regional languages. These regional languages have been or are being adopted for purposes of administration in the various States. This cannot be ignored. To-day we have adopted Tamil as the language of administration as far as Madras is concerned. Other States are adopting their own regional languages for administrative purposes in their own areas.

Now, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition forcefully pointed out the role which English played in unifying the country and in the development of the country, particularly the role it played in the scientific and technological field. I concede this. Not only I concede, but I fully endorse the point of view put forth by the Leader of the Opposition. But the point for consideration now is, when we are functioning as a democracy, wherein the people will have to be associated at various levels with the administration and also with the decisions which would be taken in respect of very many knotty questions, the language of administration assumes some importance. Therefore, when we adopted Tamil as the language of administration in Madras State, it was not out of any emotion or emotional attachment to the Tamil language. Democratic functioning requires that we should adopt a language for administration which would be understood by the millions of people—by the masses. If a language, which is confined to a minority and to the intelligentsia alone, is adopted as the language of administration, I have no doubt in my mind that we may have a very efficient administration, but we would not have a democratic administration. That is why it became necessary, as a practical necessity, when we adopted the democratic basis of administration, to have a language which would be understood by the masses of the people. These are the things which have been taken into consideration. At the same time, we cannot attach too much importance to this aspect also. Work at the expert level has to be carried on, and that has been carried on till now only through the English language. The English language is quite fitted and well developed for the purpose. It may not be possible to say that everything should be carried on in a language which is understood

by the masses. Therefore, though we have adopted Tamil as the language of the State, still, we are using the English language even for this debate on language. That is because, in the transition period, it is absolutely necessary to do so. What will be the length of this transition period, I am not able to say just now. During the transition period, we cannot say that we shall not have anything to do with English because it is the language of the foreigners. That is why we are still sticking to it and we are carrying on our business at the highest level through the English medium. Therefore, it is necessary even at the Union level to take into account these two aspects, namely, (1) for the purpose of making democracy a success, we should have a language which is understood by the masses of the people, and (2) there is no deterioration in the quality of the work. Taking these into account, we did not want to leave English even after 1965—fifteen years after the coming into force of the Constitution. We have come to that practical conclusion—it is not emotion—that English should continue to be available for the purpose of administration at the Union level. I wish to point out that this is not an emotional approach, as far as administration is concerned. It is more a practical approach to make democracy a success and at the same time to see that the administrative apparatus does not break down for want of facility of any particular language to meet the various needs of the administrative apparatus. This is what we have taken into account and we have provided for it. Therefore, if anybody should charge us with emotional approach to the language problem, I respectfully submit that it is a wrong understanding and wrong reading of the facts. We all agree that Hindi to-day is not sufficiently developed to be the language of administration even in association with English. I have no doubt about that. Even after 1965 it may not reach that stage. But having given the status to Hindi of being the language of administration, should it not be developed so that it may reach that level of development? Whenever a step is taken for the development of Hindi, should we say, 'No, no; Hindi is imposed on us?' We should be sincere about the decision we have taken on the bilingual formula, in which case every step will have to be taken to prepare the Hindi language to attain that stage and level. When any step is taken for the development of Hindi, if one should say that it is an imposition of Hindi, then I am afraid that we ourselves are not quite clear about the decision we have taken. Therefore it is we have to understand the implications of the decisions we have taken and the recommendations we have made and also the acceptance of the recommendations. If we, from this aspect, look at the Presidential Order with regard to the various steps to be taken for the development of the Hindi language, not for the purpose of immediate adoption as the language of administration, but to make it the language of administration along with English and to take its place at least after 1965—even then if it should be a limping horse, I am afraid this bilingual formula may break down at that point —it will be conceded that it is necessary for the Union Government, particularly when this bilingual formula has been accepted by everybody, to take certain steps for the development of the Hindi language. This is the important aspect which we will have to bear in mind. As far as the solution to this problem is concerned, I concede that there can be different approaches. But, after all, it is not by taking different viewpoints that it would be possible to find a solution. It is by bringing together all the different points of view and arriving at a unanimous decision—it might be that we compromise certain points of view—that we solve a problem. Still, ultimately when a decision is

taken, it should be a decision which is accepted by all. That is why, Sir, when we say that this language problem should be solved in a way satisfactory to all, we should not go with the impression that it should be satisfactory to us alone and that it does not matter if it
11-30 a.m. does not satisfy the other people. In the same way, the other people should not take the attitude that it should be satisfactory only to the Hindi-speaking areas and that it does not matter what happens to the non-Hindi-speaking areas. It should be satisfactory to both. It is from that point of view that we have arrived at this solution, and I am glad that has been accepted and welcomed fairly by all people, without any notable exceptions. Therefore, the various steps that will have to be taken have to be not in accordance with what we think as right but on lines acceptable to all. Wisdom lies in our taking a stand which would not only look practicable but also reasonable, taking into consideration the country as a whole. There are people speaking different languages. I am not making this remark with reference to Madras alone but with reference to all areas, particularly the Hindi-speaking areas, because those people have to realize the difficulties of the non-Hindi-speaking people. In our basic approach, we must remember two fundamental things, the unity of the country and its multi-lingual nature. The solution should be such as will satisfy and be acceptable to the various linguistic groups in the country. Then, Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that, even though we might have different points of view, it should be possible to arrive at an agreed solution. But if any approach is made with the division of the country in view, then the problem becomes a little more complex.

To-day, a party has entered into the field for the purpose of enforcing our linguistic rights, a party which does not believe in the unity of the country but which has a positive programme of partitioning the country. Kindly look at the reactions, if this party puts forward any proposal in regard to the language issue. Even if it is found reasonable and considered just by many of us, immediately suspicions are aroused because here is a party with a positive programme of partitioning the country. It has no faith or belief in a united India functioning. As far as language is concerned, it is for a united India. Therefore, if a party with a positive programme of division of the country, puts forward any solution for the whole country, naturally persons who have faith in the unity of the country begin to feel that the linguistic problem is being exploited by the party for advancing its own programme of dividing the country. The question of finding a solution which would strengthen the unity of the country is quite different. Here, if we make an approach, even if it be initially wrong, we will be ultimately right. But if we approach the problem with the idea of division of the country, it will create confusion in the country, on the basis of which perhaps that party will say, the country should be divided. Therefore, I find the D.M.K. entering the field of the language controversy, instead of strengthening our hands, has weakened our position. Here is a party wedded to the division of the country and if that party puts forward a solution which would unify and strengthen the country, people begin to suspect, since any sensible man who has faith in his own programme will be interested in policies and programmes which will strengthen his own hands. Therefore, I am afraid that the D.M.K. has not helped in any way in solving the problem. That is a real fact which we have to keep in our mind. That is why the Union Minister for Home made the significant remark that a party with a programme

of partitioning the country had come forward to carry on this linguistic agitation. Therefore, I would request the D.M.K. to make up their minds as to what their programme is. If they believe in the partition of the country, let them kindly keep aloof from this Union language issue, which is with reference to a united India and leave it to those of us who believe in the unity of the country to deal with it in the best way possible. But if they have a reservation in their mind that in particular circumstances all other problems could be solved in the proper way and that there is no objection to remaining in India, then they have a place in the Union language controversy. That is a point I would make not only for the consideration of this House but of the people of this State and the country as a whole. Some people believe that it is the D.M.K. that has helped to solve this question. That is only a superficial view, even though the D.M.K. has in a way spotlighted the agitation and brought about the assurance of the Prime Minister. As I said, on the face of it, it might look that the D.M.K. has helped us; but, I tell you, ultimately the problem has been made much more complex. Any approach that we may make, if that has the support of the D.M.K., is likely to be looked upon with suspicion, not by intelligent people who may be able to know the merits and demerits of a proposition, but by the masses. We are not concerned with intelligent people and statesmen alone. We are concerned with the masses of the country. Unity has to come from the lower levels and not from the top. Therefore, if a particular formula is put forward by a party which believes in the division of the country, it is likely to be looked upon with suspicion by the masses of the people. Intelligent people may of course take an unprejudiced view.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN: Sorry for interrupting the trend of the speech of the Hon. the Minister for Finance. When the original proposal was sent by the Madras Government with regard to the bilingual formula, the D.M.K. leader was a party to it. I would like to know whether he stands by it now or whether there is any change.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I stand by it. That is why I am unable to understand their unilateral action now. I was just going to refer to it but meanwhile, I am glad, Mr. Raza Khan has drawn my attention to it. The pertinent question would be how the D.M.K. can have any place in the solution of the language problem in the particular circumstances of the case. The solution must be found in association with all other parties and an all-India approach must be made. But if they take upon themselves the mantle to find a solution and carry on agitations, I am afraid they will be creating the wrong atmosphere, and solution would become more difficult. This is a point of view that strikes me as fundamental and, therefore, I am placing it for the consideration of the House, the D.M.K., the people of the State and the people in the country.

Then, Sir, incidentally the question of the medium of instruction also has been raised by an amendment. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition also—he is a staunch believer in the English language and I am also a staunch believer in the English language from another aspect (hear, hear)—came forward with the idea that we would be slipping back if there should be a change in the medium of instruction. Sir, this is not a full-dress debate on this aspect of the question. I hope a day will be set apart for discussing that problem also later on. But since that matter has been raised now I want to place briefly my

11-40 a.m

point of view before the House. The study of the language is one thing and the medium of instruction is completely a different thing. It is an accepted principle everywhere in the whole world and in every country that for the purpose of studying a language, if it should be considered necessary that it should necessarily become the medium of instruction at the various levels, then no country could have learnt any other language except its own language which has been adopted as the medium of instruction. Study of a foreign language is, no doubt, difficult. But there are methods of study and teaching of foreign languages. Perhaps we have not had improved methods of teaching because all along we have been trying that language as the medium of instruction also. Now we have a programme of reorientation of the teaching methods of English language. That is why we are deeply engaged in the retraining of our teachers who have to teach English. Therefore, if the question is put whether we should study English or not, I am cent per cent in agreement with anybody who says that it should be studied, that it should be efficiently studied and that it should be well studied. But what are the methods to be adopted? If the present methods are inadequate, those methods will have to be readopted and changed if necessary. That is quite a different thing altogether. I do feel today that without the help of the English language even the Tamil language cannot be developed (hear, hear). It is not only the question of the Tamil language being developed. In the present circumstances I am entirely of the view that we may not be able to share in the development of science and technology without the help of the English language. On this I have no difference of opinion with anybody. But when it is put forward that for the purpose, it is necessary to have it as the medium of instruction at every level, there I will joint issue with anybody who takes that point of view. I am prepared to consider any method which would strengthen the study of the English language. Now psychology experts say that the study of a language could be done only before the child reaches the age of ten. After that it will be difficult, it is said, for the child or anybody to absorb a foreign language. I am prepared, therefore, to consider the question at what stage the teaching of English should be started. Some time back we, in our schools, started teaching English from the sixth standard. Now we are starting from the fifth standard itself. If, after consideration, we reach a decision that it is not even enough to start the teaching of English at the fifth standard—the child will be just 10 years old when he reaches the fifth standard and he would be passing that impressionable age, but it should be started even from the very beginning—we can do that. I have seen children learning even three languages from the primary stage. At least two languages could be easily taught. They are none the worse for it. Their memory is greater and they are more intelligent. But it is quite a different matter altogether. But to insist that the medium of instruction should be the foreign language for the purpose of keeping abreast of the various developments taking place in the world, is a thing with which I am unable to agree, even though in the transitional period, I do agree, particularly with reference to science and technical education and various other professional education, we have not yet reached a stage when we could adopt the Tamil language as the medium of instruction. If only hon. Members would take care to study the language medium policy of the Government of Madras, they would find all these things are provided for. But unfortunately it is made to appear that overnight and suddenly Tamil has been made the medium of instruction in all spheres and in every college

and, therefore, English will not be available for our students either as a language or as a medium of instruction. That is a completely wrong and distorted picture which, if I may say so, is being intentionally given out by interested parties.

Then, Sir, certain remarks were made with regard to the imposition of Hindi language even from now on. As far as the Constitution is concerned, up to the year 1965, English will continue to be the language of administration for all purposes without any limitations or restrictions. And if Hindi has got to be used for any purpose in the place of English, it has got to be provided for in the Presidential order under article 344 of the Constitution. That article has clearly laid down that there should be no limitation in the use of the English language at this juncture. And, therefore, there is no question of Hindi being used in the place of English for any purpose up to the year 1965. That is the effect of the order of the President.

SRI S. NATARAJAN: That is the law. But what is the practice?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I will come to that point. But I have no doubt in my mind that there are language fanatics in every part of the country. It is not confined to one area alone. There are language fanatics in the extreme South, in the North, in the middle and in the East and West. And if these fanatics happen to have a say in the matter, naturally some undesirable things take place. I am not prepared to say that everything that is taking place in the Union administration with reference to the Hindi language can be justified. There are things to which we can take reasonable objections—not unreasonable as far as we are concerned. But that is quite a different matter altogether. But what we have got to look into is the law, and the general policy which has been adopted by the Government. If there are mistakes in the implementation of them, if some enthusiast comes forward and distorts the picture, it is necessary that we take note of it and apply corrective methods for that purpose. I will come to that aspect of the question later on.

One thing was mentioned about the imposition of Hindi, and that is the learning of that language by the officers of the Union Government. I respectfully submit that it is not an imposition. It is not compulsory in the sense that a person has got to learn a language and also pass a test for the purpose of continuing in the service. What has happened is, officers at higher levels, that is, officers of Grade III and above have been given the facility to learn that language. Even for these officers an age-limit has been fixed. Nobody who has passed the age of 45 and who would be functioning only for the next ten years or so need worry himself with the Hindi language at all. The other officers will have necessarily to function in a bilingual set-up. Even then it may not be necessary in the bilingual set-up that one should be proficient in both the languages. But at least one should have a working knowledge of the other language. Otherwise the bilingual formula would not work at all. That is why the age group of people below 45 has been chosen. Ten years later when Hindi may, along with English, be the language of administration, it should be possible for anybody to know what is written in the file. He should not call on somebody else's assistance to know what is written in the file and what it means, if the notes happen to be in Hindi. For this purpose he need not be a Hindi scholar. It is enough if he is able

to express himself in that language. He should be able to know the matter. That is why an elementary knowledge of Hindi will be necessary for those who will be functioning in English. In the same way a working knowledge of English would be necessary for those functioning in the Hindi language. These are complementary to each other. It is only in that sense that facilities have been afforded to these officers to learn the Hindi language. It has been made clear that even in the case of these officers who are below 45 years of age, any failure to pass a test will not act as a handicap in their prospects of promotion. This has been made as easy as possible particularly for higher level officers.

Sir, I am not prepared to agree that no attempt should be made for the purpose of bringing in Hindi even after the year 1965, even as associate language. So far as we are concerned, we have taken the decision that English should be the main language and Hindi should be an associate language. After all, there is nothing in the name, it is the substance that ultimately matters, namely, for what purposes English would be available and for what purposes Hindi would be available. It is that which we have to look into. Even with equal status for Hindi to be an associate language with English as the main language, it has got to get some preparation so that every officer will be able to function in the bilingual set-up. Therefore, even though there are certain trends in the Union Government particularly with reference to some persons functioning there, in their anxiety to promote Hindi at a very early period, they are damaging their own cause. The greater the enthusiasm among the Hindi people to bring Hindi as the official language, the greater will be the obstruction to that. It should be completely left to the non-Hindi people. We have after all accepted the bilingual formula. It should, therefore, be left to us to set the pace. Any attempt by them to force the pace will only bring about a reaction which I am sure they would not welcome.

Therefore, Sir, this very ticklish question will have to be tackled from that aspect. When today we are accepting the amendment—
11-50 a.m. the Government are accepting the first amendment of Mr. Raza Khan—we do it on the clear understanding, which has been reached after full discussion. In this connection, I want to clear one point to which the Leader of the Opposition made reference, namely, the unanimity of the decisions. When we say, 'unanimous', it is not as if everybody else has been completely converted to that point of view. Everybody has got his own point of view, but ultimately if everybody should insist on his own point of view, there is no question of any decision at all, unless everybody yields to one particular point of view. Therefore, we tried to evolve a common formula which would be acceptable to all. Instead of perhaps saying 'unanimous decision', shall I say a decision acceptable to all, taking into consideration the various facts of the case and the various circumstances? Taking into account the various facts existing in India to-day and also taking into account the fact that we will have to strengthen the unity of the country—for the purpose of strengthening the unity of the country, we will have to take decisions which would be not unanimous in the sense that they are with reference to the whole area, but which would be reasonably acceptable to every region of the country—I respectfully submit that the formula which has been put forward in the amendment of Mr. Raza Khan is the best in the circumstances. Therefore, I propose to accept that amendment.

25th August 1960]

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: May I interrupt for a minute?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: You may. I have never received obstruction from you.

SRI K. BALASUBRAHANIA AYYAR: Three points were mentioned in the course of the debate. One is with reference to numerals. The second is with reference to the money order forms being printed in Hindi. It is very difficult for we people to fill in the money order form printed in Hindi. The third is, why cannot the Central Government have the examination in Hindi after making the recruitment.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The first amendment of Mr. Raza Khan is accepted. With reference to the second amendment, even though it is a little bit out of context, I have already given the assurance to this House that we will discuss the matter. Therefore, I would request Mr. Raza Khan not to press his second amendment.

I am glad that the hon. Member Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar reminded me about three things. The first is the question of numerals. As far as they are concerned, I hold a very strong view. Even though some people may be a little bit fanatical in this matter, there is no question of numerals being in Hindi, Tamil, Marwari or Gujerati. To-day science, technology, and everything depends upon symbols and numerals. Therefore, numerals should be common to the whole world. (Hear, hear.) They should not be in the Hindi language, Tamil language or any other language. Unless we move in the direction of having common numerals and symbols, the development of technology, particularly in the backward countries, would become more and more difficult. I have no doubt about this. I had the experience of visiting a few elementary schools in the State of Bombay during my last visit to that place. Naturally enough it is a multi-lingual State. Even after partition it continues to be a multi-lingual State. There Gujerati is being taught from the primary stage. Maharatti is being taught. English is being used as the medium of instruction. Tamil is being taught. Telugu is being taught. Also Malayalam and Kannada. I visited various schools wherein all these languages were being taught. Of course, I could not understand those languages. Therefore, I thought that I should see the standard in Mathematics at least in all the schools. So I asked for the note-book of a Gujerati student. I could not read the numerals therein. I was a complete illiterate so far as the Gujerati numerals were concerned. In the same way the Maharatti language and Hindi language had their own numerals. Each language had a separate set of numerals. Only Telugu, Malayalam and Tamil have adopted without any reservation the international numerals. Therefore, if a child has to learn not only the scripts but also the numerals and then later on the symbols, we will be placing an undue burden on it. I am not looking at this question from any emotional point of view. When the Hindi language is to be adopted for All-India purposes, cannot the Hindi enthusiasts adopt not the Tamil numerals but the common international numerals which would make things easy for them also? The Prime Minister has stated that the international numerals should be used for all purposes of education in science. It is not that others should not learn other numerals. They can learn the other numerals just for purposes of research or perhaps for going through old accounts. The Prime Minister wants that every child should be

taught the international numerals and methods in science and technology. There is provision for this in the Constitution. Unfortunately, States have been given autonomy with reference to the adoption of their language for their own purposes. It should be by discussion and by convincing them that it is better we adopt the international numerals, it should be possible for us to convert them. I hope this will be one of the problems which will be tackled by all the States coming together and taking a decision that we would adopt international numerals. If people should insist that they should have only Hindi numerals, then how can they expect the non-Hindi speaking people to adopt the Hindi lauguage for administrative purposes, which is much more difficult? Therefore, they have to come down in this matter and adopt the international numerals.

Sir, money order forms did not create a big problem. As a matter of fact, when the form was printed completely in Hindi, and when I had to sign some forms, I had to sign only in marked places. I am glad that this position is being rectified and I hope it will be rectified. After all, English will continue to be available for quite a long time. Therefore, there should be the English money order form. With reference to the location of the office of issue, if it is to be issued in Madras State, in addition to English there should be Tamil also. If it is to be in a Telugu area, in addition to English, let there be Telugu. If it is a Hindi area, in addition to English, let there be Hindi. We have no objection to this arrangement.

DR. A. CHIDAMBARANATHAN: May I ask, Sir, whether it is a fact that the State Governments have been told that on their own responsibility and at their own cost, these forms would be got up in the respective regional languages and that the Government of India have divested themselves of this responsibility?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am not aware of that. But even if it should come to that, I do not mind incurring that expenditure on behalf of the State. I do not think that it is going to mean much to us. But this should be the formula which should be accepted for the purpose of solving the money order problem.

SRI T. P. SRINIVASAVARADAN: Sir, the money order commission is received by the Government of India. I do not know the reason why the State Government should incur any expenditure on this form?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The hon. Member need not get excited over this. The hon. Member may take it from me that I will safeguard the financial interests of this State and nobody will have any ground to take objection later on. I only mentioned that I was taking into account the whole thing and that I would not even mind incurring that expenditure on behalf of the State Government. This does not mean that I am incurring the expenditure immediately. Only for emphasizing the matter, I went a step further. Not only money order forms, but railway tickets also are being issued in Hindi. They should be in English. According to the location of the office of issue, it should be in the language of the state concerned. Therefore, that should be a reasonable solution to this problem also.

12 noon

With reference to recruitment to various offices, as a matter of fact, Hindi is not a qualifying test for the purpose of entry into service. It may be Hindi in the Hindi-speaking areas, as we have

25th August 1960] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Tamil here. There will be tests there in Hindi as we have tests in Tamil here because a person posted to a place must know the language of the place. For all-India Services, Hindi does not form part of the qualifying test. (Sri P. T. Rajan: Good.) It is no disqualification if a person fails in Hindi. I hope this state of affairs will continue till the bilingual formula is implemented. Tests are necessary for the purpose of finding out whether a man has working knowledge of the language of the State where he serves. He must also know English because that will also continue along with Hindi. The position has not deteriorated to such an extent that it is impossible to retrieve or impossible to find a solution so that a calmer atmosphere might prevail in all parts of the country. Language is certainly a unifying factor but it may also become such an explosive factor as will shatter the unity of the country. That should be borne in mind by everybody who dabbles in the language problem. We may take a view which may look reasonable from the individual point of view. But from the country's point of view, it may be damaging to the unity of the country, the strength of the country and the future prosperity of the country. If these fundamental facts are kept in mind, not only by this House but by the people of the whole State, then we can solve every problem that faces us to-day. I am glad to find that this House is fully aware of these fundamental facts on which our decisions have been based. If everybody concerned with the solution of the problem keeps these fundamental facts in mind, I have no doubt in my mind that a reasonable solution acceptable to the whole country which may further strengthen the bonds of our unity and help our economic prosperity is possible of evolution. Therefore, I commend the first amendment of Mr. Raza Khan to the House for acceptance. I am sure he is not pressing his second amendment.

SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER: What about teaching in a common script?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: It is a long-range question. Let us not try to solve every problem; let us go step by step. If we reach a solution on the existing basis, then the next generation will be wiser than we and take a wiser decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Raza Khan pressing his second amendment?

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN: In view of the fact that this House will have another opportunity to discuss this matter and because of the very great contribution made by the Hon. Minister who gave a very brilliant exposition of the Government's stand, I do not want to press my second-amendment and I beg leave to withdraw it.

The second amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: With his usual grace he has withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the first amendment to vote. The question is—

"*Add* the following at the end:—

'and, on such consideration, this House recommends to the State Government that the Central Government be requested to undertake appropriate legislation in order to implement the Prime Minister's assurances regarding the continued use of the English language for the official purposes of the Indian Union.'"

The amendment was put and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the main motion, as amended, to vote. The question is—

"That the policy of the Madras Government on the official language be taken into consideration and on such consideration, this House recommends to the State Government that the Central Government be requested to undertake appropriate legislation in order to implement the Prime Minister's assurances regarding the continued use of the English language for the official purposes of the Indian Union."

The motion was put and carried.

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS BUILDINGS (LEASE AND RENT CONTROL) BILL, 1960

(L.A. BILL No. 20 OF 1959)—*cont.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Bill, 1960, for consideration clause by clause.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is—

"That clause 3 do stand part of the Bill."

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN: Sir, I move the following amendment:—

"In the Explanation I to sub-clause (1) (*a*) (ii) *omit* item (ii)."

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: I second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amendment moved—

"In the Explanation I to sub-clause (1) (*a*) (ii), *omit* item (ii)".

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN: Sir, the other day, the Hon Minister in charge of Electricity took pains to explain the trend of the working of the various departments of Government. Sir, their original idea was to do away with accommodation control and to retain rent control and also prevent evictions as far as possible. I did not like to argue at that stage whether his point of view was correct. Now if that is correct, at least they could be consistent in not insisting upon accommodation control over non-residential buildings. May I bring to your notice, Sir, that even in the matter of accomodation control over residential buildings, we have restricted its scope by making only those who are new comers to the State eligible for accommodation. The idea of the Government is that this law cannot remain permanently in force and that attempts should be made to see that decontrol starts gradually. Well, the Government cannot give an assurance when that stage will come. Secondly, as far as residential houses are concerned, we are informing the Controller about vacancies and he can allot them to Government servants if he considers them suitable. But where is the necessity to inform the Controller about vacancies in respect of non-residential buildings?